

# Open Research Online

---

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

## The Symphony as a Novel: Mahler's Tenth

### Thesis

How to cite:

Pinto, Angelo (2020). The Symphony as a Novel: Mahler's Tenth. PhD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2018 The Author



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21954/ou.ro.0001140b>

---

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

---

[oro.open.ac.uk](http://oro.open.ac.uk)

# The Symphony as a Novel: Mahler's Tenth

by Angelo Pinto

MA (Sciences of Arts, Music and Performing Arts,  
Alma Mater Studiorum University of Bologna, 1997)

Undergraduate Degree (Sciences of Arts, Music and Performing Arts,  
Alma Mater Studiorum University of Bologna, 1997)

Submitted on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2019

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

The Open University



*The contradiction which we find between the reality of the world and its incompleteness is the contradiction between the omnipresence of consciousness and its involvement in a field of presence.*

Maurice Merleau-Ponty

To Sara and Clelia Elsa

In memoriam:

Umberto Eco (1932–2016)

Henry-Louis de La Grange (1924–2017)

Gérard Genette (1930–2018)

# Acknowledgments

My thanks go first to my supervisors, Robert Samuels and Ben Winters, for their constant, rigorous and tireless support and encouragement in all my Ph.D. studies. I will keep hold of their main teaching, which was not to detach analysis from hermeneutics and cultural history, and not dismiss my critical approach for a moment.

Special thanks go to other scholars who helped me by reading and commenting on my drafts and inviting me to present the outcomes of this research in seminars: Jörg Rothkamm (Musikwissenschaftliches Institut, Universität Tübingen) and Federico Celestini (Institut für Musikwissenschaft, Universität Innsbruck). Warm thanks to Frans Bouwman for his valuable suggestions on the Tenth's chronology of composition and his kind permission to publish extracts from his chronological transcriptions of the manuscript of Mahler's Tenth; to Reinhold Kubik, vice president of the International Gustav Mahler Gesellschaft, for his help in finding the location of manuscripts; to Chiara Lombardi (Dipartimento Studi Umanistici, Università di Torino), for her suggestions about literary studies; and to Maurizio Giani (Dipartimento delle Arti, Alma Mater Università di Bologna). Thanks also to the staff members of libraries I visited, giving me access to Mahlerian manuscripts—in particular, thanks to Andrea Harrant at the Musiksammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Alena Parthnaud and Natalie Popof at the Médiathèque Mahler in Paris, and María Isabel Molestina-Kurlat at the Sherman Fairchild Reading Room, Pierpont Morgan Library in New York.

Finally, my affectionate thanks go to my family: to my wife, Sara, for her loving support and encouragement, and exceptional thanks to my daughter, Clelia Elsa, born during my dissertation writing and so giving me another strong motivation to do well in my work.

# Abstract

Ever since Theodor W. Adorno published the book *Mahler. Eine Musikalische Physiognomik* ('*Mahler. A Musical Physiognomy*') it has been commonplace to discuss the music of Gustav Mahler in narratological terms—that is, to search his music for structural analogies with narrative, using the approaches of 'musical narratology'. Given their focus on only the work's final version, however, the writings in this field do not pay enough attention to the authorial dimension of how Mahler constructs his musical 'novel' through the compositional process. However, a study of narrativity in the compositional process can more easily shed light on Mahler's musical fragmentariness as a modernist expression of his music than traditional narratological approaches can. In this thesis I suggest the existence in Mahler's Tenth Symphony of a narrative strategy I call 'narrativisation', which runs through the compositional process, leaving traces of what I call 'narrativity' in sketches and drafts. The method that supports these hypotheses is a three-stage analytical apparatus applied to each movement of the Symphony. The first stage analyses the narrativity of the Symphony's draft of the last compositional phase. In the second stage, I then apply the method to the entire compositional process, including all the available sketches and drafts of the Symphony. In the third stage, I consider evidence from the two previous stages in support of an overall narrative interpretation of each movement and the whole Symphony. As a result of my analysis, for each movement and the entire Symphony I suggest that, during his conception of the work, Mahler manifests an overall 'scriptorial' narrative intention, aimed to represent in music, meta-referentially, an in-progress process of writing.

# Contents

## Volume I

Acknowledgments .....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
List of abbreviations .....	xvi
Information on References to Appendices .....	xviii
Introduction .....	1
 Chapter One. The Composer's 'Narrative Impulse' .....	5
1 'Time' and 'Voice' in Mahlerian Literature.....	5
2. The 'Narrative Impulses' of the Listener and the Composer .....	17
3. Definitions of 'Musical Narrativisation' and 'Musical Narrativity' .....	21
4. A Framework of Cultural History .....	26
5. Narrativity within Mahler's Compositional Process .....	30
6. Towards a 'Genetic' Analysis of Mahler's Narrativity .....	37
 Chapter Two. History of the Symphony's Creative Process .....	42
1. The Study of Mahler's Compositional Process: Philological Basis .....	42
2. The Stages of Mahler's Compositional Process .....	45
3. The Tenth's Primary Sources .....	48
4. Preliminary Issues of Chronological Ordering of Pages .....	49
5. Chronology of the First Movement .....	51



5.1 Chronology of the PSK (Table 2.2, II, 3) .....	52
5.2 Chronology of the DSS, the SS and the OD (Tables 2.3–2.5, II, 3–6) .....	54
6. Chronology of the Second Movement (Tables 2.6 and 2.7, II, 7–9) .....	56
7. Chronology of the Third and the Fourth movement (Tables 2.9–2.14, II, 11–16) .....	59
8. Chronology of the Fifth Movement (Table 2.15, II, 17–18).....	62
9. The Tenth’s Creative Process through Letters and Testimonies.....	63
10. ‘The Quill is in my Hand’ .....	70
 Chapter Three. Narrativity and Narrativisation in the First Movement.....	75
1. The Analysis of the ‘Story’ Level .....	76
2. The Analysis of the ‘Discourse’ Level .....	88
3. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 1–111 (Exposition) .....	96
4. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 112–140 (Development) and 141–182 (Recapitulation).....	101
5. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 184–212 (Climax) .....	105
6. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 213–275 (Coda) .....	110
7. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the First Movement .....	115
 Chapter Four. Narrativity and Narrativisation in the Second Movement .....	128
1. The Analysis of the ‘Story’ Level.....	128
2. The Analysis of the ‘Discourse’ Level .....	134
3. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 1–245 .....	139
4. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 246–415 .....	143
5. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 416–522 (Coda) .....	147
6. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the Second Movement.....	150

Chapter Five. Narrativity and Narrativisation in the Third Movement.....	158
1. The Analysis of the ‘Story’ Level .....	158
2. The Analysis of the ‘Discourse’ Level .....	170
3. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the Third Movement.....	175
 Chapter Six. Narrativity and Narrativisation in the Fourth Movement.....	 182
1. The Analysis of the ‘Story’ Level .....	182
2. The Analysis of the ‘Discourse’ Level .....	190
3. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 1–165 (Exposition).....	198
4. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 166–379 (Development).....	202
5. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 380–522 (Recapitulation).....	207
6. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the Fourth Movement .....	210
 Chapter Seven. Narrativity and Narrativisation in the Fifth Movement .....	 218
1. The Analysis of the ‘Story’ Level .....	218
2. The Analysis of the ‘Discourse’ Level .....	228
3. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 238–400 .....	236
3.1 The Process of Narrativisation in the First Area .....	236
3.2 The Process of Narrativisation in the Second Area.....	239
4. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the Fifth Movement .....	241
 Chapter Eight. ‘The Writing Hand’ .....	 247
1. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the Entire Symphony .....	247
2. Summary of the Research and its Contribution to Scholarship.....	253
 Bibliography.....	 257

# Volume II

## Appendices (Examples, Tables, Figures)

Abstract.....	iii
Information on Musical Example .....	xvii
Appendix to Chapter Two .....	1
Table 2.1: Numbering of the Pages of the Manuscript's Drafts .....	2
Table 2.2: Tenth Symphony First Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the PSK .....	3
Table 2.3: Tenth Symphony First Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the DSS .....	3
Table 2.4: Tenth Symphony First Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the SS.....	5
Table 2.5: Tenth Symphony First Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the OD .....	6
Table 2.6: Tenth Symphony Second Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the DSS .....	7
Table 2.7: Tenth Symphony Second Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the OD .....	9
Table 2.8: The two versions of bars 246–415.....	10
Table 2.9: Tenth Symphony Third Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the DSS.....	11
Table 2.10: Tenth Symphony Third Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the SS .....	12
Table 2.11: Tenth Symphony Third Movement, the Compositional Chronology	

of the OD .....	13
Table 2.12: Tenth Symphony Fourth Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the First DSS (FD) .....	14
Table 2.13: Bars covered by pages IV-FD1 and IV-FD3-6 .....	15
Table 2.14: Tenth Symphony Fourth Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the Second DSS (SD) .....	16
Table 2.15: Tenth Symphony Fifth Movement, the Compositional Chronology of the SS .....	17
Appendix to Chapter Three .....	19
Ex. 3.1 .....	20
Ex. 3.2 .....	21
Ex. 3.3 .....	22
Ex. 3.4 .....	23
Ex. 3.5 .....	24
Ex. 3.6 .....	26
Ex. 3.7 .....	27
Ex. 3.8 .....	28
Ex. 3.9 .....	29
Ex 3.10 .....	30
Ex 3.11 .....	32
Ex. 3.12 .....	33
Ex. 3.13 .....	34
Ex. 3.14 .....	35
Table 3.1: Tenth Symphony First Movement, Overall Multi-Levelled Formal View .....	37
Table 3.2: Compositional Chronology of the Initial 78 Bars .....	40

Ex. 3.15 .....	42
Ex. 3.16 .....	43
Ex. 3.17 .....	44
Ex. 3.18 .....	45
Ex. 3.19 .....	48
Ex. 3.20 .....	49
Ex. 3.21 .....	50
Ex. 3.22 .....	52
Ex. 3.23 .....	53
Table 3.3: Comparative Table of Versions 1–6, Bars 183– 212 .....	56
Table 3.4: Harmonic Features of Sections <i>Event x'</i> , <i>Event x''/I</i> and <i>Event cI</i> in the SS, and <i>Event cI</i> in the OD .....	57
Ex. 3.24 .....	58
Ex. 3.25 .....	60
Ex. 3.26 .....	61
Ex. 3.27 .....	62
Ex. 3.28 .....	63
Ex. 3.29 .....	64
Table 3.5: Compositional Chronology of the Occurrences of <i>Event x</i> , Bars 1–15, 39–48, 104–111, 183–193, 244–52 .....	65
Appendix to Chapter Four .....	66
Ex. 4.1 .....	67
Ex. 4.2 .....	70
Ex. 4.3 .....	72
Ex. 4.4 .....	73
Ex. 4.5 .....	74

Ex. 4.6 .....	75
Ex. 4.7 .....	76
Table 4.1: Tenth Symphony Second Movement, Overall Multi-Levelled	
Formal View .....	77
Ex. 4.8 .....	80
Ex. 4.9 .....	85
Ex. 4.10 .....	87
Ex. 4.11 .....	88
Ex. 4.12 .....	89
Ex. 4.13 .....	91
Ex. 4.14 .....	92
Ex. 4.15 .....	93
Ex. 4.16 .....	94
Ex. 4.17 .....	95
Ex. 4.18 .....	96
Ex. 4.19 .....	96
Ex. 4.20 .....	97
Ex. 4.21 .....	99
Ex. 4.22 .....	99
Ex. 4.23 .....	100
Ex. 4.24 .....	101
Appendix to Chapter Five .....	102
Ex. 5.1 .....	103
Ex. 5.2 .....	105
Table 5.1: Sequence of Periods in Section A and Coda, and the	

‘External Refrain’ .....	106
Ex. 5.3 .....	107
Ex. 5.4 .....	108
Table 5.2: Strophic Organisation of Section B .....	108
Ex. 5.5 .....	109
Ex. 5.6 .....	110
Ex. 5.7 .....	111
Ex. 5.8 .....	112
Table 5.3: Tenth Symphony Third Movement, Overall Multi-Levelled	
Formal View .....	113
Appendix to Chapter Six. ....	116
Ex. 6.1 .....	117
Ex. 6.2 .....	120
Ex. 6.3 .....	120
Ex. 6.4 .....	121
Ex. 6.5 .....	121
Ex. 6.6 .....	122
Ex. 6.7 .....	124
Ex. 6.8 .....	125
Ex. 6.9 .....	125
Ex. 6.10 .....	126
Ex. 6.11 .....	127
Ex. 6.12 .....	128
Ex. 6.13 .....	128
Table 6.1: Sequence of Sections of Bars 1–56 .....	129
Table. 6.2: Tenth Symphony Fourth Movement, Overall Multi-Levelled	

Formal View.....	130
Table. 6.3: The Sequence of Events, Bars 287–311.....	136
Table. 6.4: Chronological Sequence of Manuscript Pages for <i>Event f</i> , bars 287–311 .....	136
Ex. 6.14 .....	137
Ex. 6.15 .....	138
Ex. 6.16 .....	139
Ex. 6.17 .....	141
Fig. 6.1.....	142
Ex. 6.18 .....	143
Ex. 6.19 .....	144
Ex. 6.20 .....	145
Ex. 6.21 .....	145
Ex. 6.22 .....	146
Ex. 6.23 .....	147
Ex. 6.24 .....	148
Ex. 6.25 .....	149
Ex. 6.26 .....	150
Ex. 6.27 .....	151
Ex. 6.28 .....	152
Ex. 6.29 .....	153
Ex. 6.30 .....	154
Table 6.5: Version 1 of Bars 174–311.....	155
Table 6.6: Version 2 of Bars 174–311 .....	155
Table 6.7: Version 3 of Bars 174–311 .....	156
Ex. 6.31 .....	157
Ex. 6.32 .....	158



Ex. 6.33 .....	159
Ex. 6.34 .....	160
Ex. 6.35 .....	160
Appendix to Chapter Seven. ....	162
Ex. 7.1 .....	163
Ex. 7.2 .....	164
Ex. 7.3 .....	164
Ex. 7.4 .....	165
Ex. 7.5 .....	166
Ex. 7.6 .....	167
Ex. 7.7 .....	167
Ex. 7.8 .....	168
Ex. 7.9 .....	168
Ex. 7.10 .....	170
Ex. 7.11 .....	171
Ex. 7.12 .....	172
Ex. 7.13 .....	173
Fig.7.1 .....	174
Ex. 7.14 .....	175
Table 7.1: Tenth Symphony Fifth Movement, Overall Multi-Levelled	
Formal View. ....	176
Ex. 7.15 .....	179
Fig. 7.2 .....	183
Ex. 7.16 .....	184
Table 7.2: First Version of Bars 238–248 .....	185
Table 7.3: Second Version of Bars 238–248 .....	186

Table 7.4: Third Version of Bars 238–248 .....	187
Table 7.5: First Version of Bars 298–400 .....	187
Table 7.6: Second Version of Bars 298–400.....	188

# List of Abbreviations

## Libraries' and Manuscript's Acronyms (in brackets the RISM sigla)

ÖNB: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna (A-Wn)

BSB: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (D-Mbs)

PML: Pierpont Morgan Library, New York (US-NYm.)

PSS: Paul Sacher Stiftung, Basel (CH-Bps)

BA: Bauhaus Archiv, Berlin

GvE: Gottfried von Einem's page

IGMG: Internationale Gustav Mahler Gesellschaft, Vienna

## Editions' Acronyms

RF: Ricke Edition (1967)

ZF: Zsolnay Edition (Specht, 1924)

CF '76: Cooke Edition '76

CF '89: Cooke Edition '89

## Mahler's letters

AME: Alma Mahler Erinnerungen (1940)

GMAB: Gustav Mahler: Alma-Briefe (de La Grange-Weiss, 2004)

## Other abbreviations

PSK: preliminary sketch stage

DSS: draft short score stage

SS: short score stage

FD: first draft short score

SD: second draft short score

OD: orchestral draft

i.ii.iii. iv, etc.: stave in a manuscript page or its transcription

# Information on References to Appendices

References to the appendices are indicated with the Roman number ‘II’ and an Arab numeral indicating the page; e.g. ‘II, 5’. Every manuscript page is indicated with my reference siglum: e.g., I-DSS1. In this label, the Roman numeral indicates the movement, the acronym designates the compositional stage and the Arab numeral the position of the given page in the compositional sequence presented in the tables in the Appendix to Chapter Two, II, 2-15. The relevant library’s signature of each page can be found by consulting these tables.

# Introduction

Ever since Theodor W. Adorno published the book *Mahler: Eine Musikalische Physiognomik* (1960), it has been commonplace to discuss the music of Gustav Mahler in narratological terms—that is, to search his music for structural analogies with narrative using the approaches of ‘musical narratology’. The studies in this field provide convincing ideas and methods especially from the two areas of Mahler's narrativity I consider: the possible representations in music of the narratological dimensions of ‘voice’—a given narrator—and ‘time’ — the events recounted by him/her.<sup>1</sup> The existing literature, however, does not give enough attention to the authorial dimension of how Mahler constructs his musical ‘novel’ through the compositional process, given that studies are focused only on the work’s final version.<sup>2</sup>

We can thus see only the tip of an iceberg of the phenomenon but not the submerged part that could explain many enigmas of Mahler’s music. Without this view, in fact, we cannot explain the *why* of many open issues posed by the current literature on Mahler’s narrativity: the subversion of traditional musical forms, the often strongly contrasting musical ideas, the intertextual mixture of musical materials of different origins. Seth Monahan (2008, p. 1) observes that ‘from their earliest performances, Mahler's symphonies have driven listeners to the question of what his music *means*, in a sense that transcends their immanent musical materiality’ (emphasis in original). Then, it seems to me natural to search for this meaning and these *whys* in a narrative strategy not only in the work’s final version but also, even

---

<sup>1</sup> I refer to the writings I present in Chapter One, section 1.

<sup>2</sup> Two rare writings which focus somewhat on narrativity within the compositional process are those by Stephen Hefling (1998) and William Kinderman. I comment on them in Chapter One, section 5. Probably the rarity of such approaches is due to the controversies in the field of musical narrativity (mentioned in Chapter One, section 1) and, for Mahler’s works, to the scarcity of surviving compositional materials.

especially, in the entire compositional process, including all the available sketches and drafts.

Differently to musicology, in literary theory an established trend of studies combines narratology with manuscript study within ‘genetic criticism’.<sup>3</sup> Lars Bernaerts and Dirk Van Hulle (2013) believe that this approach is particularly appropriate to modernist literary works that demonstrate a work-in-progress nature in their fragmented narratological structure and the continuous redrafting to which they were subject in their conception. In these cases, these works’ apparent narratological inconsistency and structural fragmentation are seen as the last outcome of a creative process whose study is essential to tracing a hermeneutic which considers the author's narratological strategy.<sup>4</sup>

The kind of approach suggested by these genetic criticism studies seems particularly suitable for Mahler’s music and especially for the Tenth Symphony—and not just because of the incompleteness of this work (Mahler died before finishing it, so it is ‘technically’ a work-in-progress, subject to further changes). Indeed, this approach seems potentially fruitful in this case because the Symphony’s manuscript includes perhaps the greatest number of sketches existing for any of Mahler’s works. In this way, we can reconstruct possible relationships between structure, narrative, and the hermeneutic in the compositional process, from the initial sketchy musical ideas to the draft of the last compositional stage.

Current scholarship on this Symphony generally applies traditional categories of analysis to the work’s compositional process and neglects the study of its narrativity. In this way, the risk is to explain only the effects but not the causes of the enigmas of this Symphony. Steven Coburn (2002, p. 169), for example, explains the choice of the keys of some sections in the orchestral draft (OD) of the second movement in purely musical terms, invoking the

---

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Raymonde Debray-Genette (2004).

<sup>4</sup> In the field of literary studies there is also an increasing interest in the aesthetic implication of the incomplete state of given works. See, for example, Anna Dolfi (2015) and Thomas Harrison (2017).

traditional category of a tonal relationship between the first and second movements. I will suggest instead, in Chapter Four, p. 146, that this tonal symmetry Coburn correctly identifies is subordinate to a narratological tonal plot of the movements.

But there is another, stronger reason that suggests this kind of approach. The literature about Mahler's compositional process often claims that Mahler's music can be considered a work-in-progress, in the authorial sense suggested by the essay by Bernaerts and Van Hulle. In the same way that modernist writers often continued to revise their works extensively, Mahler's compositional process was also iterative. In this light, James Zychowicz (1988, p. 12) in his dissertation, *Sketches and Drafts of Gustav Mahler, 1892–1901: The Sources of the Fourth Symphony*, observes that Mahler was used to adding 'Retuschen' ('retouches') to the final versions of his works even after their publication. Most of these 'Retuschen' seem to come from the exigencies of performance. Sometimes, however, these revisions can be linked to some 'narrative' or programmatic intention, as happens in the second movement of the Second Symphony, according to Hefling (1988).<sup>5</sup> In another sense, the often observed modernist internal fragmentation and apparent inconsistency in Mahler's symphonies make us suspect that they can have an intrinsically unfinished, in-progress nature, like the literary works considered by Bernaerts and Van Hulle. Consequently, this kind of approach, never yet attempted in Mahler scholarship, seems to me one of the most useful ways to understand Mahler's musical narrativity.

The scope of my research, then, is to investigate the narrativity of Mahler's Tenth Symphony from a 'genetic' perspective—that is, by studying the compositional process to understand how he constructs his 'narrative' from the initial sketches to the draft of the last compositional stage. More specifically, my research question is how Mahler's Tenth in its

---

<sup>5</sup> I will discuss this essay in Chapter One p.34.



compositional process can be regarded as a novel, both from structural and hermeneutic points of view.

# Chapter One. The Composer's 'Narrative Impulse'<sup>6</sup>

In this chapter I present an initial theoretical framework for my research. In sections 1, 2 and 3 my aim is to identify a general model of the composer's 'narrative impulse' by discussing different positions in the vigorous debate on musical narrativity. In particular, in section 3, I will define, at a general level of theory of music, the two terms which are essential to my authorial research question—'narrativisation' and 'narrativity'—within an epistemology taken from Umberto Eco's semiotics (1990).

In sections 4 and 5, more specifically, I will glean suggestions from the existing literature on possible narrativity in the compositional process of Mahler's music. Finally, in section 6, I will sum up the entire chapter and create an analytical apparatus with which I will analyse Mahler's Tenth Symphony in Chapters Three to Seven.

## 1 'Time' and 'Voice' in Mahlerian Literature

'Time' and 'voice' are the two terms borrowed from narratology, which occur most frequently in Mahlerian literature. The term 'voice' refers to the persona (an external or internal narrator) that is speaking in a given narrative. 'Time' designates all the temporal relations between the 'story', or 'what is told' in a chronological order of the events of a narrative and the 'discourse', 'how it is told' in an actual (and not necessarily chronological) unfolding of the events in the text.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Earlier versions of this chapter and its part were published respectively as Pinto (2019) and Pinto (2017).

<sup>7</sup> I borrow the terms 'story' and 'discourse' from Seymour Chatman (1980).

The starting point for reflecting on the dimension of time in Mahler's music is Adorno (1960/1992, pp. 60–81), in his masterful monograph, *Mahler: Eine Musikalische Physiognomik* (*Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy*). Adorno compares Mahler's searching for an alternative temporal order—the novelistic—to that of classical sonata form (1960/1992, p. 63). Under Adorno's influence, this comparison of Mahler's music with the novel has continued using conceptual grounds—mainly semiotics and narratology—which are distinct from Adorno's philosophical apparatus. From the perspective of narratology, then, the terms 'story' and 'discourse', mentioned above, provide an additional means of comparing musical and literary texts.

Carolyn Abbate (1991, p. 52) was one of the first musicologists to develop specifically this comparison, especially with regards to Mahler's music, although she adopts a sceptical position on this issue. She maintains that music lacks an important narrative feature identified by the philosopher Paul Ricoeur: the capability of 'manipulating time, of using tense to achieve a kind of moral distance in recasting the referential object' (Abbate 1991, p. 52). In verbal language, this capability is performed through a narrator and a past tense that 'marks' the narrating voice, but a conjugation is absent in the semiotic system of music. The evident limit of Abbate's approach is that she does not consider the possible alternative ways of musical signification that could somewhat compensate for its obvious lack of verb tenses. So, Abbate's suggestion that music lacks a past tense has triggered a vigorous debate about possible narrative temporality in music. This reflection has led to a search on another semiotic level—that of the connotative—for an explanation, beyond mere referentiality, of the 'temporal manipulations' which other musicologists have noticed in Mahler's and other composers' music.

Some authors search for a narrative temporality in self-referentiality (by comparing music to a fiction whose characters can be considered the musical features themselves) and

intertextuality (narrative meanings and functions as determined by references to other musical texts through more-or-less shared codes). Two of these studies, by Robert Samuels (1995) and Vera Micznik (2001), are especially revealing on the issue of ‘temporal manipulations’ in Mahler’s music.

With this point of view, Samuels, following Adorno, analyses a passage of Mahler’s Fourth Symphony: the climax at the end of the development. He notices that the border-point of this passage (and of the entire developmental section) is a general pause that seems a signal of disquiet, put ‘not even within the bounds of metre, but simply introduced at the double bar-line’ (Samuels, 1995, p. 142). The subsequent recapitulation then ‘begins in the middle of a phrase, with the developmental outcome of first and second subjects’ (Samuels, 1995, p.142). Moreover, ‘the thematic and harmonic scheme have got out of synchronisation here [...] since the first subject begins before the double bar line (disguised by a pause, the voice-leading, and changes of instrumentation and texture)’ (Samuels, 1995, p. 142). As a result of these devices, ‘formally, and at the level of textual discourse, this moment is the outcome of aporia, presenting the continuity of the formal unit as a fiction’ (Samuels, 1995, p. 142). In other words, here it is a conflict between codes (those of thematic continuity, of motivic development and formal schemes). These are features of a ‘quotation-mark music’—Adorno’s definition (1960/1992, p. 96)—which, I would add, implies narrative-temporal slippages.

Following Samuels and Adorno, I suggest that another conflict in this passage, one between all musical ideas which precede this pause-milestone, plays a peculiar role in these slippages. On the one hand, there is a ringing sound of sleigh-bells in the movement’s introduction, described by Samuels as ‘an expression of Mahlerian modernism’ (1995, p. 141). On the other hand, two Haydnesque or Mozartian themes (via Schubert, quoted in the first theme) express a stylised past (termed ‘archaism’ by Samuels, 1995, p. 141). At the

climax, Mahler develops the introduction by distorting it phantasmagorically and dramatically, inserting the trumpet-call motive of the death march subsequently used in his Fifth Symphony. As Samuels notices, ‘here we have not only music in the past tense, but also future tense too’ (1995, p. 143). So, without the option of a denotative device for a past tense, the composer creates similar temporal manipulations by borrowing past musical styles.

Micznik’s essay proposes what can be considered the most convincing model of musical narrativity, in terms of theoretical credibility and analytical validation. She asks, ‘What are the conditions under which we need to invoke narrativity in our analyses, or under which our “narrative impulse” is stronger?’ (2001, p. 198). She answers that this ‘narrative impulse’ is triggered not only, as Jean Jacques Nattiez (1990, pp. 240–257) thinks, by extra-textual factors (e.g., titles, programmes, the composer's inspiration) but also by textual, narrative qualities of the music itself. If, because of its denotative weakness, music cannot be narrative in the most complete and intelligible way of a novel or tale, it can still possess musical features which place it somewhere on a spectrum of a greater or lesser musical ‘degree of narrativity’.<sup>8</sup> To identify these special narrative features, she transposes some narrative concepts taken or adapted from narratology into the realm of music by grouping them into the two above-mentioned narratological categories of ‘story’ and ‘discourse’. Under the heading ‘story’ she abstracts, on a paradigmatic plane, the musical units which are comparable to narrative events and analyses their meanings ‘from the simplest to the more complex—from explicit to implicit—semiotic levels (morphological, syntactic and semantic) as a demonstration of what makes them [comparable to] “events”’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 199).

Unfortunately, Micznik does not provide explicit definitions of the ‘morphological’, ‘syntactic’, and ‘semantic’ levels she employs. Her article implies that these terms refer to

---

<sup>8</sup> Micznik's scalar conception of narrativity could be traced back to White (1980, pp. 5–27; see section 2 of this chapter for further references to this theory), and Prince (1982).

basic linguistic and semiotic categories, that, for the sake of clarity of my further discussion, it is necessary to explicate here. By ‘morphologic level’, she means the description of the features of musical units (from single notes to themes to movement sections) and their comparison. By ‘syntactic level’, she means the study of hierarchal and functional aspects of these units (in terms, for example, of ‘tonal syntax’). By ‘semantic level’, she means the study of the possible meanings inferable from these units.

Moreover, Micznik does not propose or borrow an explicit definition of musical ‘events’. Rather, she implicitly refers to a widespread definition of them in terms of narrative’s fundamental unities, articulated by a ‘change of state’, whose marker is a verb tense (see, for example, Michael Scheffel, 2001). From Micznik’s theory, I argue that another semiotic function at least partially compensates in music for the lack of conjugation. A comparison of musical units (cells motives, themes, and so forth) with ‘events’ is possible when they have autonomous connotative semantic content, determined primarily by self-referential and intertextual meanings. In a piece with a high degree of narrativity, the semantic content is conveyed by less conventionalised secondary parameters more than by the primary parameters that refer to a self-referential semiotic system determined by tonal conventions.<sup>9</sup> These secondary parameters refer to general patterns of ‘processes of accumulation, velocity, dissolution, [and] disorientation’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 226). In my terms, the secondary parameters refer more directly to an extra-musical world and thus are more comparable than the primary parameters, though without their higher denotative precision, to the referentiality of the events of verbal narrativity.

---

<sup>9</sup> Micznik’s distinction between primary and secondary parameters is based on Subotnik (1981, pp. 84–85) and Leonard Meyer (1989). By following Meyer (1989, pp. 14–16) Micznik considers primary parameters ‘syntactic’, ‘because they depend on syntactic constraints (melody, rhythm, harmony)’ (Micznik 2001, p. 200), and secondary parameters, ‘statistical’, ‘because they can have only a “statistical” characterization (dynamic level, tempo, texture, timbre, rate of activity, register, etc.)’ (Micznik 2001, p. 200).

The articulation of these semantically autonomous units ('events') in their syntagmatic discursive sequence during the piece is a part of Micznik's dimension of 'discourse'. In this category, she examines 'the particular mode of unfolding [...] of these events within the "musical formal discourse" of the respective movements and the capabilities of the "discourse" itself to produce meanings through "gestural connotations" and through "temporal manipulations" and through "discursive syntax and functions"' (Micznik, 2001, p. 199). Micznik borrows these 'narrative functions' — 'nuclei' and 'catalysers'— from Roland Barthes's *Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives* (Barthes, 1977, pp. 93–97). The nuclei are 'cardinal functions' and 'hinges' of narrative, the catalysers 'fill in the narrative space separating the hinge functions, accelerate, delay, give fresh impetus to the discourse, summarize, anticipate and sometimes even lead astray' (Barthes, 1977, p. 95).

Micznik's phrase 'gestural connotations' she defines as 'musical gestures which are homologous to structures or processes from other [extra-musical] domains of reality, often realized musically through secondary parameters [...] thus replacing the tonal goal-orientated plots' (Micznik, 2001, p. 226). Moreover, gestural connotations overshadow the conventional tonal plot, accounting for Rose Subotnik's 'series of analogous structures, what seem to be other autonomous layers of meaning' (Micznik, 2001, pp. 226–227). I would add that in the management of discursive teleology, in a piece having a high degree of narrativity, these structures often assume a leading role, comparable to that of tonal goal-orientated plots. They do this by determining an overall 'gestural plot', to which the other discursive, narrative features described in this section contribute.

'Temporal discursive processes' are equivalent to Gérard Genette's narratological dimensions (Genette, 1972/1980, pp. 33–160); they produce narrative meanings by 'duration', 'frequency', 'speed' and 'order'. Within the dimension of 'Temporal discursive processes', Micznik considers the discrepancy 'between the discourse as presented in the

musical text and an “ideal” temporal discursive scheme (which could consist of older formal models, generic schemes or an expected expressive pattern)’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 235) and the temporal scheme established at the beginning of the piece. For duration in Mahler’s Ninth Symphony, she notes ‘a gradual increase in the time-span between the two themes during the [first] movement’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 236). Concerning frequency and speed, she remarks that ‘Mahler’s use of variable tempos, [...] the great number of pauses, accelerations and decelerations, constantly affects the unfolding of events so that the “discourse” is more gestural, connotative of non-musical, more universal concepts’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 236). Regarding order, she remarks upon ‘the tension between the potential traditional ordering expected from the functioning of events in a first movement sonata form and the rules established by the specific events’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 236).

Micznik’s perspective deserves to be enlarged to consider Genette’s narratological notions of ‘alterations’ (Genette, 1972/1980, pp. 194–198), not considered by her but which can be found in Mahler’s music, as suggested by my analysis of the Tenth, in Chapters Three to Seven. ‘Alterations’ can be of two kinds: ‘paralepsis’, the inclusion of an event against the norm of a particular ‘focalization’, and ‘paralipsis’, a similarly transgressive omission of such an event. According to Genette, the norms which are violated by these ‘alterations’ are established by the author in each particular text. In music, then, I consider a ‘paralepsis’ the addition and a ‘paralipsis’ the omission of a musical event against the two above-mentioned orders: the ‘ideal’ conventional temporal discursive scheme (such as sonata form) and that established at the beginning of the piece.

In musicology, the term ‘voice’ has been advanced since Adorno’s book on Mahler, where he was the first to pinpoint an *extra-textual* level of the act of making music—considered as potentially comparable to a narrative—in a communicative context. ‘Even where the musical process seems to say I, its correlative, analogous to the latent objective



first person of the literary narrative, is divided by the gulf of the aesthetic from the person who wrote the phrase' (Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 24). The influence of Adorno's groundbreaking theorisation remains essential to continue a vigorous discussion of a possible narrative agency in music, though upon other conceptual grounds—mainly semiotics and narratology—which are distinct from Adorno's apparatus. In this debate, some authors I discuss in the following pages, seem to credit the idea that morphological discontinuities and a high gestural physiognomy of musical ideas can play a crucial role in their personification by the listener. In this process a further step seems necessary: attributing this voice (otherwise impersonal) to someone (for example, a narrator) who performs the action of telling. This passage of Adorno's may doubtless be problematic, given the weakness of referential–denotative meaning in music.

In this trend of musicology, narrative theory is often an essential comparative term, so it is worth considering Genette's theory (1972/1980, pp. 212–262). Here the voice (or narrator) is defined by its narrative level and by the relationship to the story it is telling. Concerning the narrative level, the voice can be 'extradiegetic' or 'intradiegetic' if it is external or internal, respectively, to the story. Concerning the relationship with the story, the voice can be 'heterodiegetic' or 'homodiegetic' if it is absent or present, respectively, in the story itself as a character in the same story.

A similar theory is present in Edward T. Cone's 'The Composer's Voice' (1974). In this essay, Cone asks, 'If music is a language, then who is speaking?' (1974, p. 1). He goes on to consider the multidimensional perspective of the different possible narrative or dramatic voices (also termed 'personae' and 'agents' by him). In particular, he argues that in music it is the composer who speaks, but that he must always be distinguished from the actual composer—like a literary alter-ego (Cone, 1974, p. 84). Again, the composer does not speak directly, but via the proxy of different roles who are the implied personae involved (like

characters in a narrative). These personae can easily be identified in opera or vocal music, thanks to the verbal text. In Cone's example of Schubert's *Erlikönig*, within the text are the narrator, the father, the son and the Elf-King).

This personification is, however, more difficult in purely instrumental music. For the case study of Berlioz's *Symphonie fantastique* (1974, pp. 81–114), Cone considers symphonic music the realm of the 'experiencing subject'. Here, in the absence of a verbal aid such as a sung text, 'the complete musical persona' can be 'unitary' (in the case of a solo instrument) or represented by 'virtual agents'. Provided the related musical ideas are highly characterised, these are groups of instruments that assume roles analogous to those of literary characters. Cone's search for signs in the musical text of the central role of the composer ('the composer's voice'), to which the other agents can be traced, relies upon undeniable textual features which refer to a historical–aesthetic context provided by Cone in his essay—that is, in the case of this Symphony, Berlioz's *Traité d'instrumentation et orchestration*, his notes to this Symphony's first edition, and the composer's letters: all documents considered by the musicologist for the sake of the composer's *intention* and *plan*. This aspect of Cone's work is not fully developed, however, requiring a complete reconstruction of the communicative process he clearly and properly invokes. In this perspective, Cone's theory needs to consider the entire compositional process as a part of this communicative act within that performative dimension persuasively outlined by him.

On the one hand, as is true of other pioneering works, Cone's essay has in one sense been masterly in identifying a new perspective, one which has been highly responsive to significant research developments. But on the other hand, Cone sometimes seems to generalise too much in his otherwise brilliant intuitions. For instance, the identity of Cone's 'virtual agents' depends almost entirely on the instrumental characters in themselves (for example, the emergence of instruments from the orchestra). These appear too general and

trans-historic to be considered narrative or dramatic features which might be related to the composer's poetics or to the aesthetics of his time. This observation seems still more useful for the medium of music, whose semantic content is leveraged primarily through connotation. The suspicion in such cases is that the narrative (or dramatic) nature of music tends to be regarded by scholars as a trans-historic, totalising *normative system*, as in verbal narrative. Instead, the realm of musical narrativity is non-normative, given that, according to Lawrence Kramer (1995, p. 189), narrative in music constitutes 'a critical or disruptive process rather than a normative one'.

Another controversial aspect of Cone's essay is its monologic conception that brings the multiple voices conveyed by musical gestures back to a single agency: that of the composer. This interpretative key is probably adequate for late eighteenth- to early nineteenth-century novels, to which *Symphonie fantastique* is surely comparable. But according to Federico Celestini (2014) and Julian Johnson (2009, pp. 47, 130, 132, 134), Mahler's music seems more akin to Mikhail Bakhtin's 'polyphony' of the late nineteenth-century novel (see pp. 29-30, for further engagement with Bakhtin's theory). As Johnson states: 'the deployment of voices in a Mahler song, let alone a symphony, erodes the sense of an implied authorial persona behind the personae of voice and accompaniment' (Johnson, 2009, p. 5).

Because of these kinds of objections, some subsequent authors, while still working with Cone's agential perspective, have limited the applicability of his paradigm, to Mahler's music in particular. Solely by analysing the first movement of Mahler's Second Symphony, Abbate (1991, p. x) refutes Cone's monologic conception. In her view, these voices operate only in episodic 'moments of narration', which set apart and, in many cases, disrupt the flux of the piece around them and decentre our sense of a single originating speaker' (1991, p. 251). Again, in analysing Mahler's Ninth, Anthony Newcomb (1997), perhaps as a response to Cone's agential model, warns that 'aspects of agency are not continuously displayed'

(1997, p. 133). In the second movement of this Symphony, Newcomb identifies an agency intended as a contrast of feelings within the hypothetical protagonist's personality in a topical moment (the passage from a *Ländler* to a waltz). The identification with only one protagonist is supported by motivic–thematic relations of continuity between these two sections. Moreover, the intimate personality contrast finds a foothold in temporal discontinuity, like that of the change of tempo. In his view, then, 'music [...] is the representation and re-enactment of a complex pattern of intentional human actions' (1997, p. 131).

A further limitation of Cone's theoretical range is exposed by Lawrence Kramer (1995). In his view, given that music cannot narrate and that a music narrator is impossible or irrelevant, musical agency is impersonal (1995, p. 119). Far from shutting down the issue, however, he recognises that the personification of musical listening is an unavoidable strategy for humanising this impersonal agent, who is very difficult for a listener to describe. To better explain this peculiar impersonality of musical agency, Kramer quotes Fred Maus, pointing out that 'this feature [...] is akin to the silent, invisible intelligence that guides the montage of a film' (Maus, 1991, pp. 33–34). But Kramer also observes that 'the musical subject speaks with the kind of anonymous voice typical of literary discourse set in the ongoing present' (1995, p. 120). Another of Kramer's very important ideas is that the presence of the impersonal narrating musical agent is essentially ascribable to one of the three dimensions of narrative he himself identifies: narratography. This makes agential aspects ascribable to the dimension of the *writing process*. So 'narratography can be said to govern two broad areas of representation: the temporal disposition of events within and between narratives on the one hand, and the sources of narrative information—from narrators, characters, fictional documents, authorial agency on the other' (Lawrence Kramer, 1995, p. 100).

Particularly interesting for my purposes are the notions of voice and agency, developed by Byron Almén (2008). He demonstrates a theoretical completeness in an organic ‘theory of music narrative’—perhaps one of the most complete panoramas in this field, combining theories of Eero Tarasti (1979), Micznik (2001) and James Liszka (1989). From Liszka and Micznik he borrows two narrative analysis levels involved with the voice dimension, which he calls ‘agential’ and ‘actantial’. The ‘agential’ level, adapted from Liszka (1989, p. 120), refers ‘to the level of narrative analysis within which musical agents such as theme- or motive-actors are articulated and defined and their morphological, syntactic, and semantic features described’ (Almén, 2008, p. 229). This corresponds completely to Micznik’s ‘story’ (Almén, 2008, p. 224). Almén’s actantial level is the stage of narrative analysis within which musical agents interact—that is, ‘the level at which these units acquire their narrative roles or functions’ (Almén, 2008, p. 229); and this level corresponds to Micznik’s ‘discourse’ (Almén, 2008, p. 224). 16

Like others of Micznik’s ‘events’, agents occur when the presence in the piece of contrasting musical gestures suggests to the listener an articulation of discrete semantic contents. But Almén is more specific than Micznik in distinguishing events that can be bearers of ‘actoriality’, ‘a discursive category involving semantic units that have acquired the status of anthropomorphised subjects to participate in a narrative trajectory’ (Almén, 2008, p. 229). To understand when these units can acquire actoriality, Almén quotes Tarasti’s analysis of Chopin’s G-minor *Ballade* (Tarasti, 1994, pp. 161–165). Almén points out that ‘in the actorial analysis [...] Tarasti tracks two parallel trends, the *gradual* supplanting of the waltz theme by the quasi parlando material as the main actor and the *gradual* emergence of hidden connections between the two themes and recitative-like introduction’ (Almén, 2008, p. 59; my emphasis).

In my view, what identifies an agent as ‘actor’, other than its disruptive gesturality, is its

diachronic, teleological evolution during the piece (as indicated by the italicised word ‘gradual’ in Tarasti’s quote). Another, stronger, marker of an idea’s actoriality may be its participation in a narrative gestural plot. A typical marker of this diachronic dimension is also the recurrence of a given ‘actorial’ idea in new forms during the piece. This aspect finds its theoretical codification in Adorno’s definition of Mahler’s ‘variant’, exemplified in his beautiful metaphor about the second movement of the Fifth Symphony’s secondary idea, which is *transformed*, ‘as if, unexpectedly, a previously unregarded person now entered the scene to assist development, as in Balzac and [...] Walter Scott’ (Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 71).

Moreover, I wish to extend Almén’s terms and apply them not only to the work’s final version, on which his theory is based, but also to the compositional process. Thus, we can discern whether the composer intentionally triggers the listener’s interpretive response by the actoriality of given musical ideas gesturally connoted. A related task is to understand, by examining preparatory materials, if there is an ‘actorial’ teleology across sketches and drafts of such musical ideas—in other words, if there is a pathway of their ‘actorialisation’ during the compositional process. This task is particularly useful for Mahler’s music, considering that these kinds of musical ideas sometimes seem to have an ephemeral, sketchy character coming from some ‘past’ of the writing (a previous stage of the compositional process) which needs to be more clearly identified and explained.

## 2. The ‘Narrative Impulses’ of the Listener and the Composer

Some of the above theories have a perceptual basis. In other words, they assume the listener’s or analyst’s standpoint. The move from the narrativity of the listener to that of the composer, which is my focus, could be further accomplished, as I will do in this section, by enlarging the theoretical perspective from musicology to literary theory.

From the perspective of musicology, ‘narrativisation’, ‘narrative impulse’ and the verb

‘to narrativise’ are recurring terms almost always used to refer to the listener’s behaviour of making a narrative triggered by a piece of music, and never to the composer’s narrative strategy. Nattiez (1990, 2006) uses these concepts of ‘narrative impulse’ and ‘narrativisation’ to maintain a sceptical opposition to music narratology. In his view, given the weakness of the denotative musical–referential dimension, any possible narrative of music is located merely outside of the text. In more specific terms, musical narrative comes from a listener’s ‘narrative impulse’, triggered by external verbal support such as a title or programme, not by music in and of itself. For Nattiez, this makes music ontologically incapable of being (or even expressing) a narrative. More specifically, Nattiez claims that by narrativising a piece of music, the listener attempts to fill a gap, because of music’s low referentiality, between musical, morphological and syntactic elements on the one hand, and semantic elements on the other. He clearly states that ‘music is not narrative and any description of its formal structures in terms of narrative is nothing but superfluous metaphor’ (Nattiez, 1990, p. 257).

Later in the same essay, a little bit incoherently but fruitfully for my perspective, after having thrown narrativity out the door of the musical text, Nattiez attempts to bring it back through the window in the form of an analysis that seems to be a description of musical structures in terms of narrative. Thus, he identifies in some musical works (Nattiez, 2006, pp. 261–271) ‘pure [...] sound configurations’ that can induce ‘narrative conducts’ in the listener through ‘references’ to and ‘imitations’ of narrative (Nattiez, 2006, p. 262). Moreover, he identifies in these works the imitation of prosody (Nattiez, 2006, p. 263) and the exterior appearance of a narrative. Finally, he highlights the role of literary inspiration in the genesis of a musical work and a ‘narrative intention’ (2006, pp. 268–271) of the composer in the case of Schumann’s *Carnaval*. In spite of the authorial narrativising process he identifies, however, his scepticism causes him to close the door on a more substantial and detailed perspective of the notion of an author’s ‘narrative impulse’ in his text-producing

activity.

A careful review of literary studies leads to a broadening of the concepts of ‘narrativisation’ and of ‘narrativity’ in the perspective of authorial ‘narrative impulse’. The theory of the historian Hayden White (1980), quoted by Nattiez and Micznik, investigates these concepts by studying text-construction strategies in historical narrative (called ‘history proper’). In this genre, the writer *fills gaps* between historical events presented in a fragmentary manner in annals or chronicles where ‘the *objectivity* of narrative is defined by the absence of all reference to the narrator’ (White, 1981, p. 7; my emphasis). To do this, a historian adds to annals *subjective* discourse components called ‘causal connections’ (White, 1981, p. 13). These are comments, the voice of the author and other agents, and a plot—that is, ‘a structure of relationship by which the events contained in the account are endowed with a meaning by being identified as parts of an integrated whole’ (White, 1981, p. 13).<sup>10</sup> In this way, by a process the author calls ‘narrativising’, the historian logically connects these otherwise isolated historical events presented in annals or chronicles to make the discourse more comprehensible. Because, according to White, chronicles ‘do not conclude’, they simply terminate ‘in the form of “*unfinished* story”’ (1980, p. 9; emphasis in original), the historian provides the necessary closure. In this essay, the term ‘narrativity’ is intended as a historical text’s scalar and dynamic capability to cover the gaps and lack of ‘causal connections’ of annals and chronicles. The relevance of these aspects to my study lies in the observation that the stories of annals or chronicles in their sketchy schematics can work as history proper’s early version, subject to being narrativised in the following writing stages (and also by another hand).

---

<sup>10</sup> A conceptual correspondence between White’s ‘causal connections’ and Barthes’s ‘catalysers’ seems evident to me. If so, then White’s theorisation allows us to identify the authorial function, not adequately considered by Barthes, of these narrative functions.



The additive compositional process of narrativisation suggested by White needs to be supplemented, however, by the trend in literary studies that considers the changes in the temporal order of early sketches as an essential component of the narrative compositional process. This is a dimension which, according to Scheffel (2010), is ascribable to a long tradition of narratological studies, from Russian formalists to structuralism. In these studies, narrative is conceived as a generative writing process, through different stages of transformation of pre-existent, chronologically ordered happenings (the ‘story’) into a new discursive order (the ‘discourse’).

A shift of the terms ‘narrativity’ and ‘narrativisation’ to a diachronic communicative perspective of the work’s compositional process is a feature of the recent so-called ‘post-classical narratology’ to which Bernaerts and Van Hulle refer. Their essay (2013) focuses on the processual, diachronic nature of modernist works by combining narratology with genetic criticism,<sup>11</sup> using case studies of two works by Samuel Beckett: *Lessness* and *The Unnamable*. About *Lessness*, the essay suggests that during the compositional process, Beckett modifies the ‘natural’ and ‘familiar’—in Monika Fludernik’s (2002) sense—fictive schemata of early versions by a combinatorial and aleatory technique. According to the two authors of this essay, identifying these basic ‘natural’ schemata of the early draft recuperates part of the work’s aesthetic identity. This aspect, then, cannot be limited to the final version of this work by Beckett, an author who usually regards his ‘writings in terms of processes rather than products’ (Bernaerts and Van Hulle, 2013, p. 311).

---

<sup>11</sup> For a complete overview of this trend, see Jed Deppman (2004).

### 3. Definitions of ‘Musical Narrativisation’ and ‘Musical Narrativity’

From the literature review of the previous sections, I can ultimately define the terms ‘musical narrativisation’ and ‘musical narrativity’ from the perspective of the composer’s ‘narrative impulse’. But first it is necessary to discuss the epistemological basis of these concepts. This task is essential to my research, given that the application of musical narratological theories can be contentious, considering the significant areas of disagreement within scholarship about many issues in this field. So, in an epistemological perspective of falsifiability, it is worth considering the most radical objection, which comes from Nattiez. He employs an ontological argument to deny any possibility of music narrative, because of the low referentiality of this art form. The first part of his aphorism I quoted on p. 18 (‘music is not narrative’) is an obvious confutation of a thesis that is not maintained even by the most extreme music narratologists. The second part of the same statement (‘any description of its formal structures in terms of narrative is nothing but superfluous metaphor’) finds a contradictory denial from a possible ‘composer’s narrative impulse’, which becomes an essential element of a ‘historical hermeneutic’ that even Nattiez admits (Nattiez, 2006, pp. 261–271, see my earlier discussion, pp. 17–19).

If anything, a different epistemological problem ought to be raised. The discourses on the ‘composer’s narrative impulse’ should be supported through solid validation criteria which can justify comparing a given musical work to narrative by precise references to its textual features. The heuristic pitfalls increase as one approaches those features by applying deductively and wholesale a narratological theory conceived for literature—a medium which, compared to music, has greater normativity, referential functionality, and systematic consistency. In these cases, the danger is that the analyst finds narrative assumed as a piece’s feature led more by a wholesale application of narratological literary theory to music than

by the actual text's evidence. In this way, the risk is in overestimating the likeness and underestimating the differences from the linguistic medium. But the realm of musical narrativity, just for leveraging connotative non-conventional devices of secondary parameters, is not normative but rather *disruptive* of codified norms (for example, conventional classical tonal and formal nexuses). Another crucial aspect is that for an authorial discourse on 'narrative impulse' to be credible, it needs to find in the text many related clues of narrativity in different parameters, not just isolated narrative features.

This heuristic operation is to ensure that these clues belong to the composer's planned narrative teleology and not to other inspirational aspects that are not ascribable to this purpose. In contrast, a few uncoordinated narrative aspects cannot demonstrate with reasonable certainty the 'composer's narrative impulse', but at most only a greater effect in music of 'a general category of the human mind that involves putting temporal events into a certain order, a syntagmatic continuum' (Tarasti, 1994, p. 24). That is a cross-cultural aspect that operates in different human expressions and that finds in verbal narrative its more common cultural practices: the novel and the tale.

To avoid the pitfalls of a 'totalising' discourse on music narratology, with the aporetic and trans-historic outcomes indicated earlier in section 1, my study uses a more controllable heuristic apparatus. I do not want to consider my discourse on music narrativity in Mahler's Tenth as part of a general semiotic theory (borrowed from literary studies) of music narrative, analytically focused on Mahler's music as a case study. Instead, I start inductively, from the undeniable truth that, given its denotative deficiency, music *cannot narrate* in the most obvious, complete sense of the term, in the ways codified cultural practices such as the novel or the tale do. From this perspective, however, I admit that musical works, within certain historical-cultural circumstances, exhibit some degree of morphological, syntactic and semantic and discursive analogies. However, these features need to be demonstrated not

only in terms of similarities with but also of differences from verbal narrative.

The next step of this legitimization is a logical continuation of the pathway tracked in Micznik's and Lawrence Kramer's essays towards an authorial dimension of musical narrativity. In particular, Micznik (2001, p. 225) reflects on the genesis and evolution in the compositional process of a motive of the Ninth's first movement. At another point, she speaks of a 'composer's strategy' which is 'highly conventionalized' and 'to a large degree predetermined' about tonality in the classical period (Micznik, 2001, p. 220). Instead, for 'a late-Romantic composer like Mahler it [this "composer's strategy"] is more likely to present unusual, unexpected discursive "narrative" techniques' (Micznik, 2001, p. 220). In Micznik's essay (2001) this aspect relates to Mahler's musical narrativity via a *performative, oral* and *improvisatory* musical structural dimension, which in Mahler's style coexists with (and transforms) the conventional formal schemata.<sup>12</sup>

From this perspective, and moving a step further from Micznik and Lawrence Kramer, I use the term 'narrativisation' to indicate a narrative strategy on the part of the composer. This feature is, diachronically, the *process*, which may have left its traces *across* the entire compositional process from the initial sketches and drafts to the final text or the last stage of the existing compositional materials. I then use the term 'narrativity'—the *product*—to mean the synchronic traces of narrativisation in each of the work's versions, conceived during its compositional process.

In the light of these definitions, I can detail the notion that I have employed many times already, in the same sense of theorists of musical narrativity (Micznik, Lawrence Kramer), of 'formal conventions'. With this phrase I refer to the well-known forms (sonata form, rondo, scherzo and so on) that are very common in classical and romantic music and which

---

<sup>12</sup> In this way Micznik analytically supports Adorno's (1960/1992, pp. 60–81) intuitions.

have been codified by nineteenth-century *Formenlehre* (the German ‘theory of form’).

Mahler’s adoption of these forms is undeniably evident, even from titles and general patterns of his symphonies’ movements. Speaking of ‘formal conventions’ in Mahler’s music, however, as many scholars do, can make us think that Mahler, while composing, had in mind the rigid theoretic formal and tonal schematism of *Formenlehre*. As noted by Monahan (2015, p. 12), this aspect is difficult to reconcile without further explanations with the highly personal nature and originality of Mahler’s music.

According to Monahan (2015, p. 17), however, in the late Romantic age the fixation of the canon and the reification of such formal schemes within the *Formenlehre* coexist with an increasing deconventionalisation of musical language. Thus, Mahler ‘setting his pen to paper [...] might be entering into dialogue a daunting array of models: idiosyncratic masterworks of the past, “rule of thumb” abstractions [...] and increasingly diverse contemporary trends’ (Monahan, 2015, p. 17). To explain further this fluid relation with traditional forms in Mahler’s music, Monahan (2015, p. 17) refers to James Hepokoski’s (2009, p. 181) category of ‘dialogic form’. This theory stipulates that ‘each work, at each of its moments, is understood to imply a dialogue with a constellation of normative sonata options within the genre at that time and place in its history’ (Hepokoski, 2009, p. 181). The ‘dialogic form’, then, can also include ‘deformations’ (as defined by Hepokoski) of formal models.

In this framework, my hypothesis about the narrativity of Mahler’s form is twofold. From one perspective, these conventional, *Formenlehre* schemata, and especially sonata form, assume Adorno’s ‘nominalistic’ (Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 73) role, comparable to the epic’s fixed formulas, during the compositional process. Just as these formulas acted as aids for the memory of oral storytellers, these reified tonal–formal schemes work as aids for the composer’s compositional train of thought that searches for a less predictable and narrative

temporal pathway through disruptiveness and non-normativity. Thus, as Monahan observes (2015, p. 12), the sonata form model plays a role of ‘paradigmatic tonal drama, one that was capable of underpinning Mahler’s many highly individualized realisations’.

From another perspective, in Mahler’s music this teleological model is ‘intimately bound up with issues of expression and narrative arc’ (Monahan, 2015, p. 12) and is embedded in the expressive essence of the work. In contrast to Monahan, however, I think that these models enter in the last version through the process of narrativisation, implying their deformation during the compositional process. In a work’s final version (or in that of the last compositional stage) these conventional schemes can leave traces—‘remains’, so to speak—which can be identified and fully understood only in comparison with conventional models. These traces are surely not markers of a highly conventionalised composer’s strategy. However, these reified conventional schemes can still be significant terms of formal comparison of the versions conceived during the compositional process of the Tenth, to detect their possible narrativising deformations.

These heuristic choices, starting from my definitions above (p. 23), locate my enterprise within a perspective of ‘narrative interpretation’ (according to Micznik’s definition, 2001, p. 202) of Mahler’s music, not as a systematic theory of music semiotics. My approach uses narratological and semiotic tools, but only to realise its hermeneutic scope by searching for cultural-historical evidence in the piece’s text, enlarged to include sketches and drafts. Lawrence Kramer claims that musical narrativity is ‘performative, in the sense of the term developed by speech-act theory’ (Lawrence Kramer, 1995, p. 100). My vantage point looks beyond the mere text (including the final version of the last compositional stage and the preparatory materials) to consider the entire interactional historical-cultural context surrounding the work.

As with any interpretation, this one is subject to a control horizon that needs to be based

on a critical-historic perspective. To identify this, I use Eco's theory, from his book *I limiti dell'interpretazione* (Eco, 1990, pp. 34, 103–125: its translation in English: *The Limits of Interpretation*, 1994). According to this theory, an 'intentio auctoris' ('author's intention') is inferable only in a communicational context situated in the past and lost dimension of the work's original creative act of the 'empirical author' (the person who has actually created the work). An interpretation can be legitimised only as guesswork about the intention of the 'implied author' whom the interpreter can infer from text features (Eco's 'intentio operis'—'intention of the text'). A legitimating 'criterion of economy' (Eco, 1990, pp. 103–125) in this search for 'intentio auctoris' requires selecting only those text features that are linkable to an originating *context* of communication—the cultural environment, as historically reconstructed, in which an artwork originates. I add that this is an aspect of the artistic communicational context which, unlike everyday conversational communication, needs a more or less complex and long-lasting *creative process*, a scenario of a dense network of relations among the composer and other social actors through shared codes. In this process, it is clear that the preparatory materials also play a non-secondary role in the semiotic theoretical scenario outlined by Eco.

In summary, one can speak of 'musical narrativisation' and 'musical narrativity' every time a composer leaves traces of their 'narrative impulse' in the piece's final text, or the last stage of the existing compositional materials and preparatory materials. Considering that Mahler was an avid reader of Dostoyevsky and Sterne and many other novelists, in the case of this composer, then, this impulse seems to be a category of cultural history before being a teleological purpose that runs through his creative process.

#### 4. A Framework of Cultural History

In the general model presented in the previous sections, invoking the 'composer's

narrative impulse’ requires considering a redefinition of the author’s role in the cultural-historical framework in which a given composer—Mahler, in this case—has lived. To this end, it seems essential to refer to the most widely discussed essay on this topic: ‘The Death of the Author’, by Barthes (1966/1977, pp. 142–148). Beyond its provocative title, this essay reveals the transformation in the modern age of the role of the author from being the ‘God of the text’ to a mere mediator of networks of texts within his changed relationship with writing. This essay can lead us to the heart of one of the most acute contradictions in Mahler’s style: the confluence, noticed by Adorno (1960/1992), between modernist expression and ‘epic’, pre-modern orality. Barthes’s benchmark for this perspective is doubtless the process of writing, and the model for his reflection is Proust:

Having buried the Author, the modern scriptor can thus no longer believe, as according to the pathetic view of his predecessors, that his hand is too slow for his thought or passion and that consequently, making a law of necessity, he must emphasize this *delay* and *indefinitely* ‘polish’ his form. For him, on the contrary, the hand, cut off from any voice, borne by a pure gesture of inscription (and not of expression), traces a field without origin – or which, at least, has no other origin than language itself, language which *ceaselessly* calls into question all origins. (Barthes, 1966/1977, p. 146; my emphasis)

In Mahler’s music the complex dialectics between subjectivity and an objective use of musical materials (Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 25) invites us to find something similar to a modern scriptor’s ‘field without origin’ during the compositional process. The autonomy of writing from its author (‘his hand, cut off from any voice’)—beyond the utopia of this thesis, which is clearly provocative, like the title of the essay—indicates an undeniable orality and performativity of modernist writing which also seem to affect Mahler’s music.

Finally, in Barthes’s essay, the act of writing becomes meta-referentially its same



outcome: ‘by making of the narrator not he who has seen and felt nor even he who is writing, but he who is going to write [the author alludes to the famous close of the *Recherche*] Proust gave modern writing its epic’ (Barthes, 1967/1977, p. 144). As modern writing changes its function, it

[...] can no longer designate an operation of recording, notation, representation, ‘depiction’

[...] rather, it designates exactly what linguists, referring to Oxford philosophy, call a performative [...], a rare verbal form (exclusively given in the first person and in the present tense) in which the enunciation has no other content (contains no other proposition) than the act by which it is uttered (Barthes, 1966/1977, pp. 145–146).

In light of these Barthesian issues, I ask: as a hypothesis, if Mahler is a composer who incarnates in music this new function of the author, then in what way in his works would a detachment between his voice and his hand be ‘borne by a pure gesture of inscription (and not of expression) [tracing] a field without origin?’ (Barthes, 1966/1977, p. 146). That is, in which way in Mahler’s music is there a divorce from the author’s monologic expressive dominion of his psychological character and his objectivising writing?

An answer to this important question can be found in an essay which is a junction between a historic–cultural framework and a more specific analysis of Mahler’s compositional process: Federico Celestini’s ‘Heteroglossia and Hybridity in Gustav Mahler’s Wunderhorn Symphonies’ (2014). The theoretical premise of this essay is the consideration of the musical composition ‘as the experience of a shift in the relationship between Self and Otherness’ (Celestini, 2014, p. 385), according to the long aesthetic Western tradition to which this author refers (Celestini, 2014, pp. 385–387). He proposes calling this shift ‘de-identification’ and seeks to demonstrate its presence in Mahler’s music at a compositional level, considering

as a case study Mahler's *Wunderhorn* Symphonies and using Mikhail Bakhtin's narratological concepts of 'heteroglossia' and 'hybridity'.

Celestini's starting point is a focus on Mahler's literary interests, which include Miguel de Cervantes, Laurence Sterne, Jean Paul, Charles Dickens and Fyodor Dostoevsky, writers also considered by Bakhtin. According to Celestini, Mahler's music can be compared to the genre typical of the turn of the twentieth century, defined by Bakhtin (1994, p. 89) with the music-like definition, 'polyphonic novel'. In this genre, according to Bakhtin, the polyphony of narrative voices is manifest in their autonomy, their heterogeneity in style, the plurality of consciousness, and the internal dialogicity of the world, in contraposition with the monologic genres of poetry and drama. 'Heteroglossia' is a comprehensive label for these processes.

One of the *Wunderhorn* Symphony examples considered by Celestini to demonstrate the presence of this aspect of Bakhtin's theory in those works deserves more significant consideration for its relevance to the idea, I invoke, of 'the composer's narrative impulse'. I refer to Celestini's (2014, pp. 403–406) analysis of the Fourth Symphony's compositional process as the most typical case of his Bakhtinian perspective. According to Celestini, the genesis of this Symphony supports the strong relationship between the Third and the Fourth Symphonies. In fact, 'two undated sketches of the structure of the Third Symphony [...] attest that Mahler initially planned to conclude this Symphony with the ironical and childish 'Das himmlische Leben', an orchestral Lied composed in 1892 to a poem *Des Knaben Wunderhorn*' (Celestini, 2014, p. 404). In these two sketches this movement has the programmatic title, 'Was mir das Kind erzählt' ('What the child tells me'). Only later did Mahler eliminate 'Das himmlische Leben' from the plan of the Third Symphony, using the Lied for the Fourth Symphony not only as its finale but also as his unitary source of this work. The text of the Lied is characterised by 'disparate and contradicting elements'

(Celestini, 2014, pp. 404–405), a mixture of tones which permeates the entire Fourth Symphony between ‘structural complexity and compositional sophistication’ (Celestini, 2014, p. 404), in the full terms of Bakhtinian ‘heteroglossia’. In this view, it is also significant that Mahler initially called the Symphony ‘Humoresque’. With this title, as Celestini specifies (2014, p. 405), the composer clearly alludes to early Romantic aesthetics and in particular to Jean Paul, because ‘humor mediates between finiteness and infiniteness’, according to the early Romantic aesthetics (Celestini, 2014, p. 405).

Finally, concerning the genesis of this Lied, the essay’s author introduces another Bakhtinian term, ‘hybridization’, to designate a ‘mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance’ (Bakhtin, 2011, p. 358), which can be ‘unintentional, unconscious [...] or intentional’, ‘an artistically organized system for bringing different languages in contact with another’ (Bakhtin, 2011, p. 361). According to Celestini, then, Mahler’s humorous hybridity results from the semantic ambivalence of his ironic utterances and in the coexistence of different stylistic spheres—for example, childlike naivety and the compositional sophistication of the ‘high’ music tradition within the same music (Celestini, 2014, p. 406).

## 5. Narrativity within Mahler’s Compositional Process

The literature on Mahler’s music has never considered the search for narrativity in the compositional process as a direct, principal research object related to the hermeneutic of his music. There are, however, studies of the compositional process which approach this focus by enquiring into the works of other composers; these can be useful for my Mahlerian perspective.

Richard Kramer’s seminal book *Unfinished Music* (2008) provides the notion of ‘draft-like music’ (2008, p. 186). This concept is borrowed from Peter Gülke (1983, pp. 101–102),

who investigates the relationship between the creative process and the composed-out structure in the first movement of Beethoven's 'Tempest' Sonata, op. 31 no. 2. Gülke notes that 'the character of the piece does not, even in its definitive version, lose the improvisatory draft-like quality that Beethoven so persistently composed against the fixed components of composition' (1983, pp. 101–102, translated by Richard Kramer, 2008, p. 186). This notion in Kramer's book becomes part of a larger theory that focuses on the hermeneutic implications of the relation between the final version and the preparatory materials. He asks: 'at precisely what moment can the work be said to be completed, finished?' (Richard Kramer, 2008, p. viii). If the answer to this question appears easy, according to current musical philology's notion of 'Fassung letzter Hand' ('version of last hand'), as the only depositary of the aesthetics of the work, then it becomes fruitfully problematic in the works—by Emanuel Bach, Haydn and Mozart—that Kramer considers as case studies. At the base of his inquiry in all these cases is the central (and disruptive of conventional norms) role of improvisation as 'emblem of intuition'.

In all of his case studies, Kramer shows that this relationship between the final version (or the draft of the last compositional stage, in the case of incomplete works) and its preparatory materials is far from linear. This aspect happens since some aesthetic stances (in most cases suggested by a philosophical or literary background, as shown by Kramer) lead the composer to import the ephemeral character of early stages of the compositional process into the final version.

Kramer's case study of Beethoven's 'Tempest' Sonata seems a particularly useful model for my discourse on the first movement of Mahler's Tenth. In the first movement of that sonata, the improvisatory introductory section, having a different tempo and uncertain, tentative and recitative-like character—far from remaining an external, separated introductory slower section (as per formal conventions)—reurs many times during the

movement. In Kramer's view, according to the historical circumstances he links with the sonata's creative process, this section represents the composer's improvisatory gesture of trying a new piano by 'testing of its cavernous sonority, knees pressed against the damper mechanism' (2008, p. 199).

It is significant to my own methodology that in Kramer's analysis during the compositional process this improvisatory idea is introduced by the composer in a manuscript sheet which, according to Barry Cooper (1990, p. 183), 'gives the appearance of being a sudden inspiration' but really is a subtle reworking of a previous page (Richard Kramer, 2008, p. 196). This aspect leads Kramer to see that 'the improvisatory in the sonata is in some sense calculated, even if the written evidence for its calculus survives only in a fugitive draft in a sketchbook' (Richard Kramer, 2008, p. 207). I would add that the improvisatory draft-like gesture of this idea meta-referentially works as if it were 'composed', in the ever longer-lasting occurrences during the piece. In this way, this idea represents the 'subjective figuring of the composer's voice—of the composer as protagonist' by proxy of 'the process itself, the act of composing [which] infiltrates the substance of the work' (Richard Kramer, 2008, p. 171). The recourse to historical-cultural contingencies linked with textual features in Kramer's essay plays a decisive role in his hermeneutic. Moreover, in Kramer's approach, an essential focus is the dialectics between the 'objectifying engagement' of the work's conventional 'fixed elements' (such as, for example, the proper first theme beginning at bar 20 of that Sonata) and their breaking, occurrence after occurrence, by that recitative which is the marker of a disrupting subjectivism.

If in Beethoven's 'Tempest' Sonata this draft-like quality of music is already so evident as a consequence of an impending musical Romanticism, then it seems more natural to find some process which 'infiltrates the substance of the work' within the modernist nature of Mahler's music. Though the field of study of Mahler's compositional process is well

developed, usually what prevails instead of a hermeneutic based on compositional materials is a philological view aimed primarily at the reconstruction of Mahler's compositional process at a merely morphological–syntactical level. This aspect is undoubtedly present in two essays dedicated to Mahler's compositional process by Zychowicz (2007; 2009).<sup>13</sup>

In the first essay, Zychowicz provides us with some useful indicators I link with the draft-like dimension suggested by Richard Kramer. He indicates (Zychowicz, 2007, p. 424) that Mahler's later-stage drafts often follow improvements of ideas already conceived at the level of the earliest draft. Zychowicz characterises these initial ideas as 'ephemeral'—that is, subject to a profound reworking (Zychowicz, 2009, p. 155).

In my opinion, however, in these cases it is necessary to understand whether the 'ephemeral nature' of these ideas represents Richard Kramer's 'subjective figuring of the composer's voice', like that in the first movement of Beethoven's 'Tempest' Sonata. In another essay (2009, p. 160), Zychowicz speaks of 'modular sections that he [Mahler] would assemble later after he had the opportunity to review the ideas that emerged during this stage of the compositional process' (2009, p. 155). This leads me to suspect a narrativising strategy across the versions of Mahler's Tenth to change the discursive order of early sketches and drafts, like those changes of temporal order of early sketches theorised by scholars of compositional process of narrative. According to Zychowicz (2005, p. 425), Mahler conceived given ideas on pages entitled 'Einlage' ('insert') to cover gaps indicated by insertion signs on pages previously written. Moreover, this process often changes the formal schemes previously planned before the 'Einlage' as happens in the short score (SS)

---

<sup>13</sup> I can also mention here the dissertation of this same author, dedicated to the genesis of the Fourth Symphony (2000), and that by Colin Matthews (1977) on the Ninth and Tenth Symphonies. It is also useful to mention Anna Stoll-Knecht's dissertation (2014), which seems closer to the perspective, here invoked, of the compositional process's hermeneutic, identifying the intertextual connections in the preparatory materials of Mahler's Seventh Symphony.

of the third movement of the Fourth Symphony (see also Zychowicz, 2000, pp. 98–101). My suspicion, then, is that Mahler conceived these insertions as ‘connective’ of musical sections, to ‘narrativise’, in White’s terms (1980), the schematic materials of early sketches.

Hefling (1988) and Kinderman (2006) further deepen the hermeneutic implications of the analysis of preparatory materials (although without explicit narratological apparatuses). Hefling addresses the issue of a possible ‘narrativisation’ of the ‘schematic’ early sketches in his essay ‘Mahler’s “Todtenfeier” and the Problem of Program Music’ (1988). He works to unveil a possible hidden programme in the Second Symphony’s first movement by finding its sources in Adam Mickiewicz’s drama *Dziady*—entitled *Todtenfeier* by its German translator, Siegfried Lipiner, a close friend of Mahler. Hefling assumes correspondence between verbal text and music at two levels: the last stage of the text (the published score) and the manuscript sketches and drafts. He also uses a distinctly intertextual method. In fact, he links not only this drama and movement but also other literary and musical texts crossed with autobiographical references (the name of the drama’s protagonist, for example, is Gustav, the same as Mahler).

In the second part of Hefling’s essay, the comparison between two final versions and a provisional draft allows us to see two important aspects. First, a chronological priority is given by Mahler to single musical ideas: for example, ‘the motivically plastic *Hauptthema* and the idea that the piece would juxtapose materials of marked contrast’ (Hefling, 1988, p. 39). Second, a progressive change of the compositional formal plan occurs: from a schematic, more fragmented illustration of a programme (perhaps a heritage of Liszt’s symphonic poem form) to a more homogeneous, autonomous musical construction in terms

of the ‘expression of feeling’ suggested by Mickiewicz's plot.<sup>14</sup>

A more recent essay by Kinderman (2006) is even more subtle in analysing the Adagietto of the Fifth Symphony, concerning its relation, often claimed by the literature, with the Lied ‘Ich bin der Welt abhanden gekommen’, written earlier by Mahler. He casts doubt on that hermeneutic tradition, which can be traced back to the conductor Mengelberg, to Visconti's film *Death in Venice*, and Adorno (1960/1992, pp. 137–138), which sees in the Adagietto a solitary, introspective and intimate entr'acte in the middle of the Symphony. In contrast, Kinderman supports an argument of ‘integration’ of this movement with the others and especially with the last one of the Symphony, by motivic borrowing of both movements from the Lied.

Kinderman emphasises the similarities between the Lied and the Adagietto as evident and numerous: they include significant morphological features in common, such as ‘metre, basic tempo, and motivic material, but also the ternary design of each piece [...], harp triplets as accompaniment, the expressive use of appoggiatura figures and of harmonies blending third-related triads’ (Kinderman, 2006, p. 238). He also sees numerous differences between the two pieces as markers of a process of developing in the Adagietto a narrative teleology lacking in the Lied. More specifically, this teleology is determined by articulation of different tonal planes and by the contraposition of the central section. But a process of a deeper, teleological, fictive-like development of the Lied is evident in passages of the last movement of the Fifth Symphony, based simply on some musical ideas of the middle section of the Adagietto. This section, ‘whose restless modulations and twisting chromatic ascent to the high D at the reprise have no counterpart’ in the Lied, is recalled in three passages of the

---

<sup>14</sup> For this purpose, Hefling also quotes this sentence from Mahler's letter: ‘in conceiving the work I was never concerned with the detailed description of an event, but to the highest degree with that of feeling’ (Mahler, 1979, no. 158).



Rondo–Finale, the last of which ‘is used as a springboard for the climactic D-major chorale’ (Kinderman, 2006, p. 249). According to Kinderman, this chorale works as Adornian ‘Durchbruch’ (‘breakthrough’, theorised in Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 41) in a context in which this musical idea seems either ‘premature’ or ‘unreal’.<sup>15</sup> In the section which precedes this chorale, ‘the violin line from the Adagietto contributes to the forward-driving flow of the Rondo, and by stages it becomes a wholehearted player in the kaleidoscopic sound world of the Allegro Finale’ (Kinderman, 2006, p. 252). Kinderman explains the treatment of this material by reverting to the ‘rotational form’ of Warren Darcy’s (2001) theory. Thus, ‘the successive rotations become a sort of generative matrix within which this telos is engendered, processed, nurtured, and brought to full presence’, so that in this ‘teleological genesis’ the rotations may be construed—within the aesthetic of the time—as growing successively more ‘revelatory’ (Kinderman, 2006, p. 252).

This ‘teleological genesis’ and ‘revelatory’ trajectory of the whole of this passage is the key text on which Kinderman bases ‘a reading of these compositional strategies as implying the ultimate insufficiency of solitary withdrawal and the need for reengagement with the collective’ (2006, p. 257). What seems a process of narrativisation happens diachronically, in the creative pathway from the lyric subjectivism of the Lied to the fictive teleology of the Symphony’s Adagietto, considered as the later version of the former. But more significant is that this process also happens synchronically, within the Symphony’s last movement—Kinderman’s ‘growing successively more “revelatory”’, just the ‘process within the product’, to use a phrase by Peter McCallum (2009, pp. 123–150).

---

<sup>15</sup> I would add that the ‘illusory’ nature of this finale is also conveyed by the dissonant chord of its final cadence.

## 6. Towards a ‘Genetic’ Analysis of Mahler’s Narrativity

In what follows, I will summarise the critical aspects of this introductory chapter: a starting point of a research apparatus, presented below, which I will apply to the five movements of the Symphony in Chapters Three to Seven. This chapter’s theoretical framework, applicable to Mahler’s music but also potentially to that of other composers, is centred on my concepts related to the ‘composer’s narrative impulse’: first, ‘narrativisation’, and second, ‘narrativity’. To support heuristically textual clues of narrativisation and narrativity in a given piece, it is necessary to revert to the originating communicative context, to search for the intention of ‘implied author’ through the ‘intention of the text’, according to Eco’s theory (1990, pp. 34, 103–125). Before becoming an authorial purpose, the ‘composer’s impulse’ is a category of cultural history. It is significant, then, that the ‘narrative impulse’ of the composer arrives (with Mahler and other composers) during an age in which the traditional creative function of the author changes in music (as in literature, according to Barthes, 1967/1977, pp. 142–148). In this historical–cultural turn, the composer becomes an intertextual mediator of texts, and musical language loses the systematic normativity of conventional tonality, moving towards the non-conventionality of a gestural articulation of musical discourse.

Given this framework, my first hypothesis is that a narrative impulse—*narrativisation*—can be detected in Mahler’s writing process which, as a teleological impetus, runs diachronically through the compositional process from the initial sketches to the final compositional stage of the work. Synchronically, *narrativisation* can leave in the final version (or the draft of the last compositional stage) traces of *narrativity* which, however, are often only the tip of the iceberg of this process. My second hypothesis is that behind this impulse there is a communicative intention on the part of the composer (Eco’s intention of

the ‘implied author’) that can be more fully comprehensible only through consideration of the submerged part of that iceberg, the traces that the narrativisation has left in the sketches and drafts. In other words, if the composer tells us something by narrativisation and narrativity, this something can be inferable only if the preparatory materials are also considered.

To corroborate these hypotheses, I will employ a ‘genetic’ apparatus of narrativity analysis to detect these dimensions during the compositional process of each movement of Mahler’s Tenth. With this perspective, this study finds its method in a mix of approaches available in the Mahlerian literature, chosen for their appropriateness, in the light of the theoretical issues raised in this chapter, for this heuristic enterprise. Among these approaches, my main reference point is Micznik’s analysis of Mahler’s Ninth Symphony (2001) and, through this approach, the narratological theories by Genette (1972/1980) and Barthes (1966/1977). I have chosen Micznik’s approach as a leading theory because this apparatus leads music narrativity back to the ‘objective’ and discrete features of a musical text, so avoiding the aporetic pitfalls of ‘totalising’ theories of musical narratology.

Using the theoretic-analytic framework adapted from Micznik’s theory, I will consider specific analyses of Mahler’s Tenth by Coburn (2002), Jörg Rothkamm (2003) and others. I will add to this heuristic apparatus Samuels’s intuitions on diegetic temporal slippages implied in the stylistic borrowings in Mahler’s Fourth. I will use all these studies (and discuss their limits by proposing my alternative views, when necessary) to help me identify in the musical text markers of narrativity at Micznik’s ‘story’ and ‘discourse’ levels.

A weakness of Micznik’s approach is that it focuses only on the ‘time’ dimension. I will enlarge this theory to include analytic parameters referring to the ‘voice’ dimension. For this reason, I will adopt Almén’s (2008) theory of musical narrative to find in the musical text markers of agentiality and actoriality. Unlike Micznik’s and Almén’s methods, however,

my apparatus will be applied not only to the final version (or the draft of the last compositional stage) of each movement of the Tenth but also to all existing preparatory materials. From a comparison between the markers of narrativity detected in the former and the latter, I will infer a process of narrativisation—the composer’s narrative strategy. I will then focus on a possible overall narrative interpretation of each movement and the entire Symphony by linking the outcomes of these previous levels to a broader context of cultural history. This means that I will connect the analytical outcomes obtained through this ‘genetic’ analysis, following Eco’s line of thought (1990, pp. 34, 103–125), to contextual contingencies concerning the Tenth’s genesis, informed by letters and testimonies (presented in Chapter Two) and other contextual references.

My apparatus consists of three stages. In the first stage I will analyse the narrativity of the last phase of the existing compositional materials of the Tenth, using my version of Micznik’s apparatus. This stage is articulated in two parts:

- Micznik’s ‘story’ level: the basic musical ideas of the piece are described to understand the morphologic, syntactic and semantic features that make them comparable to narrative events;
- Micznik’s ‘discourse’ level: aimed at understanding how the unfolding of these events in the work’s musical ‘discourse’ produces ‘additional layers of meaning’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 224).

The second stage is the analysis of narrativity during the compositional process. In this stage, for each of the sections of the movement I will analyse sketches and drafts by using the enlarged Micznik apparatus of the first stage. In this phase of my analysis, I aim to identify the narrativity of changes made during the compositional process and so a possible

process of *narrativisation*—for example, when there is an increasing degree of narrativity across them.<sup>16</sup>

The third stage is an overall narrative interpretation of each movement and the entire Symphony. During this stage, I will recombine the results of the previous two analytical stages in a hermeneutic overview which aims to identify a possible overall implied narrative intention. More specifically, I will accomplish a further step from the current narratology in Mahler's music. Existing writings in this study area focus almost entirely on the dimension of *how* Mahler 'makes music in the way others narrate' (to quote Adorno's famous aphorism; 1960/1992, p. 63), with insufficient attention to the dimension of *what* he wanted (or attempted) to narrate with his music. Perhaps this happens because these studies share a theoretical premise that 'it is not that [Mahler's] music wants to narrate' (to quote again the first part of that same Adorno aphorism; 1960/1992, p. 63) but that it merely imitates narrative.

To understand what the implied composer wanted (or attempted) to narrate, I will try to identify in the Tenth Genette's 'narration'—that is, 'the act of telling [...] the producing narrative action and, by extension, the whole of the real or fictional situation in which that action takes place' (Genette, 1972/1980, p. 28). I will search in the text for a possible 'intra'-, 'extra'-, 'hetero'-, and homodiegetic narrator by his temporal relationship with the story being told, according to Genette's theory.<sup>17</sup> In semiotic terms, my final aim is to identify the *signified(s)* Mahler pursued through the *signifiers* determined by the process of narrativisation across different versions of the work.

---

<sup>16</sup> Some musical units can be qualified as 'events' but remain unchanged across the compositional process. In these cases, there is evidently no diachronic process of narrativisation, but, by applying Micznik's apparatus (2001), they can be the same markers of narrativity, if they have a morphological, syntactic and semantic autonomy which makes them just 'events', as explained in section 1 of this chapter.

<sup>17</sup> These categories are defined in section 1 of this chapter.

With this purpose, however, it would be disingenuous to suppose that Mahler, with a narrative strategy, would have wanted to tell an actual narrative, purposefully imitating the precision and normativity of the verbal medium. This aspect is also testified by Mahler's dismissal of programme music, inferable by the cancelled subtitles of movements of the Second, Third and Fourth Symphonies, and by Mahler's aesthetic conception of 'inner program'.<sup>18</sup> This theme of Mahler's scholarship is vast and controversial, deserving further research. For the sake of my research aims, here I can only define my hypothesis to support the third stage of analysis. I suspect that Mahler's narrativisation in the Tenth, if not explainable as programme music, depicts something more concrete and teleologically articulate than a more general overall 'narrative' plot archetype. Adorno observes that in Mahler's music 'the inwardness of music assimilates the outward, instead of representing, externalizing, the inward' (1960/1992, p. 70). With the theoretical pathway of this chapter, then, I suppose that in Mahler's Tenth the fragments of outwardness assimilated by the inwardness of his music are disseminated, in narrative traces, throughout the entire compositional process. Thus, having supported in the previous two stages the hypothesis of Mahler's narrativising activity, its scenario—the Genettian 'whole of the real or fictional situation in which [that activity] takes place' (Genette, 1972/1980, p. 28)—can be identified in the compositional process. In this third stage, then, my task is to map these narrative traces onto an overall narrative interpretation concerning a larger cultural context that could have inspired his creative act, according to Eco's epistemological validating parameters.

---

<sup>18</sup> See Hefling, 1988, and Donald Mitchell, 2002, pp. 187–216.

# Chapter Two. History of the Symphony's Creative Process

This chapter presents an overview of the context of the creative process of Mahler's Tenth as reconstructed by examining the extant manuscript, letters, and testimonies. The ideas of this chapter will support and validate, on textual and contextual levels, my hermeneutical enterprise, which will come from the 'genetic–narratological' analysis, of Chapters Three to Seven.

In section 1 I identify the basic philological terms I will employ from this point on. In section 2 I present an overview of Mahler's compositional habits. In section 3 I focus on the Tenth Symphony's existing manuscript materials, presenting the primary manuscript sources of the Symphony. In sections 5–8 for each movement, I will put in compositional chronological order all the available pages. In section 9 I will track the Symphony's creative process by written testimonies from the letters, with a focus on statements contained in some of Mahler's letters to his wife, Alma. Finally, in section 10, in some of these letters I will identify a possible authorial reading key of the Symphony.

## 1. The Study of Mahler's Compositional Process: Philological Basis

The basic philological terms I consider in my approach are: 'sketch', 'draft' and 'fair copy'. According to Friedemann Sallis, these terms 'suggest a linear process by which a composer, artist or writer moves from a first idea to a general outline (a draft) and then to a polished result, often called the 'Fassung letzter Hand' (Sallis, 2015, pp. 20–21). This tripartite description, however, though necessary, is often not sufficient for considering the

great variety of compositional habits and behaviours, even within one composer's output. As Sallis points out, 'in most cases, the creative process is far more complex, resembling a network of relationships rather than a straight and narrow path' (Sallis, 2004, pp. 43–44).

So, the study of the compositional process is a highly idiosyncratic research field, and this also results in scholarly disagreements over terminology. One of these regards the term 'sketch', which in the Mahlerian literature is often considered comprehensively as any form of a preparatory document, with the exclusion of only the 'fair copy'.<sup>19</sup> Sallis (2004, pp. 43–53), however, codifies a more precise distinction within this umbrella term between proper 'sketches' and 'drafts', all of which he distinguishes from 'fair copy'. In his view, then, 'sketches' are private documents, not normally intended for public scrutiny, and their function is primarily mnemonic for the composer, [and they are] inherently fragmentary and [...] incomplete' (Sallis, 2004, p. 45). 'Drafts' are also private documents, but instead 'present a work project or a section thereof that has achieved some degree of completion' by occupying 'a middle position between the mnemonic sketch [...] and the finished fair copy' (Sallis, 2004, p. 46). The 'fair copy', by contrast, has the primary function of transmitting a specific work to the outside world and appears 'complete and clearly written' (Sallis, 2004, p. 47).

Sallis' definitions open the door to a distinction that is essential to Mahler's genetic narrativity: the 'teleology' and 'non-teleology' of preparatory materials. A manuscript document can be 'teleological' or not if, at the moment of its conception, it is or is not a part of a work's (or its section's) performance order prefigured by the composer. Accordingly, a fair copy is always 'teleological' and a draft is also always teleological, even if it contains rewritten passages or even pages, cancellations or discarded ideas if there is a detectable

---

<sup>19</sup> See, for example, Coburn 2002.



performance order of the piece (or of one of its parts). A sketch page, on the other hand, can be non-teleological or teleological.<sup>20</sup> In either case, sketch pages appear fragmentary, consisting, for example, of unrelated musical ideas separated by empty spaces on the page and frequent cancellations. At the moment of conceiving non-teleological sketches, however, the composer possibly did not have in mind (or did not consider) a work's teleology. This situation can happen in a very early stage of collecting of isolated musical ideas (written in notebooks) which are, in a certain sense, self-sufficient, so that they can be used in different musical works (as happens in Mahler's notebooks) or even not be used in any works. Instead, in teleological sketches we can find a piece's performance teleology in which a given sketch takes part. This is the case in the refinement of musical ideas previously contained in a draft. Fragmentariness and discontinuity in writing are often not sufficient markers of a lack of teleology. In most cases, making such a distinction requires guesswork based on a careful observation of manuscript pages concerning the contextual compositional history inferred from letters and testimonies.

Another essential conceptual distinction to consider in this field is between the 'creative process' and the 'compositional process', two concepts I borrow from Fabian Czolbe (2014). The latter is most intuitively defined as the *writing* of the work, a process testified by the surviving manuscript materials. The 'creative process' is a more inclusive category that includes the compositional process and all of the composer's existential experiences triggering, or related to, a work's inspiration. According to Czolbe (2014, p. 45), this

---

<sup>20</sup> In the literature on Mahler's compositional process, a conventional term that can imply the 'teleology of preparatory materials' is that of 'continuity draft'. However, I prefer using the terms 'teleology' and the related adjective '(non-) teleological' instead of that conventional definition because they can be applied not only to drafts but also to sketches. Moreover, these two terms are used with the same meaning in the literature on musical narrativity to designate the 'discursive' sequence of narrative musical ideas. So, they can conceptually link the two research areas—Mahler's compositional process and musical narrativity— from which my research departs.

dimension is mainly non-teleological and, I would add, like the initial sketching stage of the compositional process. To connect this philological perspective with its key hermeneutic relation to the text–context, as I proposed in the previous chapter, my focus in the next sections will be this most comprehensive category of the ‘creative process’ of the Tenth. I will try to infer this dimension from primary sources and their possible chronological order of composition, and letters and testimonies connected with the work’s genesis. Before doing so, however, it is necessary to focus more generally on the dynamics of Mahler’s symphonic compositional process, as revealed in the surviving manuscript pages of his works.

## 2. The Stages of Mahler’s Compositional Process

The literature on Mahler’s compositional process has identified a general theoretical multi-staged model (Zychowicz, 2007, see below). But given the paucity of surviving Mahlerian manuscripts, this model should be employed as a comprehensive inventory of all possible cases rather than as a statistical, predictive sample for Mahler’s compositional habits. To ensure that the grid can also include the compositional process’s behaviours in the Tenth Symphony, I have modified the grid and integrated it with the outcomes of my direct observation of the Tenth’s preparatory material.

I thus identify these stages of Mahler’s compositional process:

1. *Plan of movements*. Zychowicz (1988, pp. 159–162) considers this the earliest stage of the genesis of the Fourth Symphony. The sequence of movements contained in this plan indicates an initial and overall teleology of the piece. No available document testifies to this stage for the Tenth.

2. *Notebooks*. This stage includes a ‘non-teleological’ collection of sketches, usually unrelated sometimes even to known works by Mahler. Two of Mahler’s notebooks are extant, but it is likely that others are yet to be discovered or were destroyed by the

composer.<sup>21</sup> One of the extant notebooks (ÖNB Mus. Hs, 41634 MAG), according to Colin Matthews (1977, pp. 104–127), contains sketches for the Ninth Symphony and a few sketches which have a very tenuous relationship with the Tenth (1977, p. 104). At present, there is no known notebook fully ascribable to the Tenth Symphony.

3. *Preliminary sketches (PSK)*. This category includes non-teleological and unnumbered pages written on one, two or at most three staves, and which present a fragmentary covering of the page, with writing gaps and often fragments eventually located in widely separated points of the final work's version. In these cases, the very crude state and the possible lack of relation to numbered pages almost certainly belonging to a continuous draft make scholars think that they were not conceived in a foreshadowed performance order, as happens in the drafts. Zychowicz (2007, p. 422) and Coburn (2003, p. 24) include in this category the 'draft short score' (see point 4).

4. *Draft short score (DSS)*. Like Cooke (1989) and Bouwman (Mahler-Bouwman 3, 2017), with this label I indicate a collection of landscape and/or portrait sheets, with music notated on two, three or four staves, with occasional indications of instruments. The pages of these drafts are often (though not always) numbered according to a performance order devised at the moment of composing them; where this happens in the Tenth, Mahler always uses Roman numerals. These pages (whether numbered or not) exhibit a certain degree of performance order continuity between them, without significant gaps in the teleology of the piece, and so they deserve the label 'draft', according to Sallis' definition. In these drafts, cancellations and rewritings of pages and 'Einlage' are frequent. Teleological sketches are also conceived during this stage. We have extant DSSs for the first, second, third and fourth movements. No DSS for the fifth movement has come to light and was perhaps never

---

<sup>21</sup> According to a testimony by Natalie Bauer-Lechner (1979, p. 125), Mahler had the habit of destroying 'everything that is unfinished'.

prepared (see the notes on stage 5).

5. *Short score (SS)*. This category includes collections of loose landscape, or sometimes portrait, sheets intended generally as a refinement of a DSS. An SS includes fewer cancellations, discarded ideas and rewritten pages and inserts, and the pages or folios are almost all numbered in a performance order. Also at this stage Mahler adds many indications of instruments. There are extant short scores for the first, third and fifth movements of the Tenth. The second movement has only a draft short score and an orchestral draft. The fact that the latter is almost a mere orchestration of the former suggests that Mahler did not write a short score for this movement. The fourth movement has two draft short scores (both numbered with Roman numerals and having many cancellations). The existing fifth movement's materials are a short score, having many cancellations and discarded ideas, and three loose sheets (two of them numbered) which fit in the performance order of the SS. These elements lead Bouwman (3, 2017, p. 45) to think that Mahler did not write a draft short score, which, as mentioned earlier, would have contained a less definitive version.

6. *Orchestral draft (OD)*. This comprises a complete score on landscape bifolios, numbered pages, and very few cancellations. According to Stoll-Knecht (2014, p. 67), at this stage 'Mahler would draw bar lines throughout the whole leaf without knowing in advance how many staves he would need'. In the Tenth, only the first and second movement's manuscripts reach this degree of completion. The OD of the third movement stops at bar 30.

7. *Fair copy*. In this stage, the score is detailed in all aspects, dated and written on portrait bifolios. According to Stoll-Knecht (2014, p. 67), 'the fair copy is usually prepared with the right number of staves required'. No movement of the Tenth reaches this degree of completion.

### 3. The Tenth's Primary Sources

The majority of manuscript pages of the Symphony are held in Vienna at the Austrian National Library (ÖNB) and in Munich at the Bavarian National Library (BSB). There are four pages in New York (PML), a bequest of the Rosé Family. The International Mahler Society in Vienna (IGMG) has a photocopy of a sketch page in portrait format which belonged to the composer Gottfried von Einem; the location of the original of this page is unknown. At the Paul Sacher Stiftung Library (PSS) in Basel is another page. Two pages formerly belonged to Henry de La Grange and are published in Mahler-Cooke (1976, pp. xxvi, xxvii). According to Bouwman (Mahler-Bouwman 3, 2017, p. 11), the former was sold to Dkfm [Diplomkaufmann] Peter Stiefelmeyer, Vienna, and the latter's current location is uncertain.

There are two published facsimile editions of the original manuscript: Zsolnay (ZF, 1924) and Rieke (RF, 1967). These facsimiles are very accurate in their resemblance to the original manuscripts and graphics quality; their great limitations, however, are that the librarian's numbering of these pages does not reflect a reliable order of composition. Instead, this aim is achieved in the recent *Gustav Mahler, Symphony No. 10 (Unfinished), Chronological Transcriptions of the Sketches, Short Scores and Orchestral Drafts* by Frans Bouwman (Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2, 3, 2017).

Of the two printed reference editions, Cooke's performing edition (CF, '76, CF '89) is the best-known completion, also containing a transcription of the manuscripts and an introduction outlining the Symphony's philological issues. Also important are the International Mahler Society editions (Mahler, 1964, 1969, 1977, 1984) of the first movement, the only movement to have reached a stage of a performable orchestral draft. Although I have consulted all these primary sources, three of them have been the primary reference for this research: the Tenth's manuscripts I have consulted in original and in

scanned copies, Cooke's edition and Bouwman's transcriptions, from which is taken the majority of the musical examples presented in the appendixes. In Mahler-Bouwman (3, 2017, pp. 8–12) there is an inventory of all of the Tenth's available pages, with descriptions.

#### 4. Preliminary Issues of the Chronological Ordering of Pages

Mahler dated none of the existing materials. So it is necessary to put all of them on the diachronic development of the work's compositional process. This task requires two stages: ordering the existing manuscript pages chronologically and, ideally, placing each of them on a timeline of the work's (incomplete) creative process. The chronology of pages is accomplished in this section. I will dedicate the next section to the history of the creative process, intended as a part of Mahler's biography.

Coburn (2003, pp. 31–59) and Mahler-Bouwman (1, 2, 3, 2017) deepened the focus of the Tenth Symphony's chronology of composition. Other authors (Colin Matthews, 1977, pp. 102–176; Bergquist, 1980; Bouwman, 2005) provide useful observations on the chronology of the composition of portions of the work. Given the large number of studies in this field and the unlikely future discovery of additional manuscript pages, the state of the art of studies on the chronological sequence of the manuscript pages of this Symphony seems to leave no space for new contributions. However, in the literature on this topic, there are some contentious issues I intend to solve, and which play a key role in my perspective of 'genetic' analysis of narrativity.

Before proceeding concretely with the chronology of each movement, there are three preliminary issues to consider. First, establishing whether a given page that can be considered a sketch is an early idea of the PSK (stage 3 of Mahler's compositional process) or a refinement in the DSS or SS (stages 4 and 5, respectively, of Mahler's compositional process). In either case, it is necessary to establish whether or not the sketch is teleological.

Second, in teleological DSS and SS, Mahler numbered pages which can easily be put in chronological order, just because in these cases the chronological order of composition corresponds to that of performance (whose markers are page numbers). Unnumbered pages may also belong to stages 4 and 5, but determining their place in the chronological sequence is far more complicated. Third, sometimes Mahler numbered pages with the same number, and here also establishing their chronological order can be difficult. I observe that where lacking Mahler's clear indication (such as numbering, or a verbal indication), the main textual criterion in establishing the chronological order of these pages within a compositional stage should be the observation of the calligraphy. This can be tentative and uncertain, or lacking those refinements then made at later stages. When unnumbered pages are teleological, identifying their position within an order of performance prefigured at the moment of their conception can definitely help determine the chronology of composition.

Mahler's numbering of pages is quite (though not always) useful in establishing the stage (DSS, SS, OD) of pages: he used Roman numerals for DSSs and Arabic numerals for SSs and ODs (see Table 2.1, II,1). Mahler applied this rule consistently to the existing material of the first movement, the only one for which the three stages—DSS, SS and OD— exist. The second movement has no SS, but the pages of that which seems a DSS, given its many cancellations, rewritten passages and inserts, are numbered with Roman numerals, and then the OD pages of this movement have Arabic numerals. In the third movement, Mahler did not number the DSS, but numbered the SS with Arabic numerals and only one OD page with the Roman numeral 'I' (it is the only exception to the general numbering rule followed by him). The fourth movement has two draft short scores (they seem so, given their many cancellations, rewritten passages and inserts, and their Roman numerals). The fifth movement then has only a short score with bifolios, whose pages were numbered by Mahler with Arabic numerals, three loose sheets whose two pages he numbered with Arabic

numerals and one unnumbered.

Given the above general premise, the next sections (5–8) present the page-by-page chronology for each movement.

## 5. Chronology of the First Movement

The most significant controversies in the literature on the chronology of the movement concerns the genesis of the initial 80 bars, because Mahler did not number (or not legibly number) some pages. The most critical points of this passage are:

- a) pages I-PSK1, I-PSK3 and I-PSK4, which Mahler did not number and seem ‘non-teleological’; they exhibit fragmentary writing and refer not just to the OD movement’s beginning but also to some of its other points; the difficult task here is to understand if they are teleological and conceived during the DSS or SS, or in a previous, non-teleological, pre-draft stage;
- b) pages I-DSS3, I-DSS4 and I-DSS15, which are in the portrait format that Zychowicz (2007, p. 423) associated with earlier stages;
- c) pages I-DSS3 and I-DSS6, which do not have a legible composer’s numbering.

Considering the critical import of these issues to what follows, in the next subsections 5.1 and 5.2, I can discuss in more detail the chronology of the manuscript pages of this movement.



## 5.1 Chronology of the PSK (Table 2.2, II, 3)

The chronological collocation of the title pages I-DSS1 and I-DSS2 seems irrelevant to my textual analysis, given their absence of musical writing. According to Mahler-Bouwman (2, 2017, p. 17), the first page chronologically is I-PSK1 (Ex. 3.17, II, 44), including bars 25–29 and 32–37. After a gap in writing, lower in the page in the third stave system, two bars cover the missing bars 30–31 with two bars that correspond to 128–129, transposed. This page seems to be the first conception of those bars, given that they are less developed than their later versions in other DSS or SS pages. These bars appear to be ‘non-teleological’, given that due to their tentative and fragmentary writing, Mahler probably conceived them without a prefigured teleology. More complex is the case of page I-PSK2, written on the verso of page I-SS9, which follows I-PSK1 in Bouwman’s chronological order (3, 2017, p. 17). This sketch, according to Bouwman, is ‘outside any chronological cycle, most probably between BSB Mus. ms. 22746 [1] [I-DSS5] and ÖNB Mus. Hs. 41000/6 [6] iii [I-DSS7], but perhaps even before BSB Mus. ms. 22746 [1] [I-DSS5]’ (Mahler-Bouwman 3, 2017, p. 17). He specifies that this sketch is ‘chronologically close to RF1 [I-PSK1]’ and is ‘later used as a second voice, inserted for the first time in ÖNB Mus. Hs. 41000/6 [6] iv [I-DSS7] bar 28—very clearly inserted later than the rest of the material’ (Mahler-Bouwman 3, 2017, p. 17). Considering that Bouwman puts this sketch, as above, ‘outside any chronological cycle’, I ascribe this idea to a non-teleological pre-draft PSK compositional stage. Strangely, however, it has been written on the verso of the page numbered by the composer with ‘8’ (I-SS9), of a later compositional stage (SS). The paper type is ‘J.E. & Co...No. 13’ which was used often (though not for all pages in any regular way) by Mahler in the DSS, so this sketch was first written on the verso of a leaf which was used later for SS pages. It is not credible to suggest a reverse chronology, given that Mahler inserted, as a second voice, the

DSS page that he had already written at the time of conceiving I-SS9 (BSB Mus. ms. 22744 [19 r.]), which is part of an SS.

The subsequent page of Bouwman's chronology is II-DSS3. At this point, however, my chronology diverges, because I put the unnumbered sketch pages I-PSK3 and I-PSK4, which Bouwman allocates to a later compositional stage (SS), before I-SS10. Bouwman also notices that I-PSK 3, I-PSK4 are 'sketches [of] 217–224b, but a fifth lower (B major) than the pitch of these bars' on the chronologically later page I-SS10. Again, Bouwman remarks that pages RF3/4 (I-PSK4) are 'segments of one leaf that have been reunited and [that] the insert on the last system of RF4 is meant for [I-SS9]' (Mahler-Bouwman 3, 2017, p 19). These sketch pages appear to be early precursors of bars 217–224, and the last system of RF4 appears to have been inserted into I-SS9 (and is unlikely to have been composed before that page). However, I allocate them to a pre-draft stage because they are a progressive development of ideas not yet located within a teleological unfolding of the piece. I base this belief on Colin Matthews (1977, pp. 127–129) who maintains that both the sketch pages I-PSK3 and I-PSK4 (excluding the last system) are the earliest precursors of the occurrences of the second theme (I will call it '*Event b(x)*' in Chapter Three). Matthews considers these sketches on their own as 'tentative elaborations' of the intro-refrain (bars 1–14), 'made at a stage when Mahler was uncertain as to the employment of this theme in the movement' (1977, p. 127). A non-teleological pre-draft positioning of these pages finds stronger support in the fact that always Colin Matthews (1977, pp. 127–129) considers these sketch pages precursors not only of the corresponding bars 217–224 of I-SS10, as established by Bouwman, but also of other passages surely conceived before this page: bars 81–84 (I-DSS9 and I-SS4) and bars 153–156 (I-DSS14 and I-SS6).

Moreover, on I-PSK3 Mahler, according to Matthews, a 'process of grafting one idea on to another' which can be detected frequently in the Ninth's notebook (Matthews 1977, p.

116), and so this procedure is perhaps typical, in the Mahlerian compositional process, of non-teleological stages. I can make the reader aware in advance that the genesis of bars 217–224 will play a key role in my narrative interpretation of the movement.

## 5.2 Chronology of the DSS, the SS and the OD (Tables 2.3– 2.5, II, 3–6)

A teleological stage seems to enter with pages I-DSS3, which Mahler numbered as 'I',<sup>22</sup> and I-DSS4, which present bars 16–37 and 48–78, respectively. But they have a crude handwriting and do not finish at the end of either page. These two aspects suggest to me that these pages are halfway between sketches and drafts, chronologically a stage before the more refined pages I-DSS5, I-DSS6 and I-DSS7, which contain the same bars. Moreover, I-DSS3 and I-DSS4 have a portrait format, different from that of the other pages. All these peculiarities of the two pages, then, suggest that, besides being the earliest precursors of these bars, they belong to a pre-DSS teleological stage, perhaps stopping at bar 78 and then being rewritten in the chronologically later page by the addition of the two occurrences of a viola recitative at bars 1–16 and 40–48. A pre-draft teleological stage, however, is not codified as a Mahlerian compositional habit and cannot be identified in this movement, because three pages in portrait format are too few to say this with confidence. Therefore, this chronological collocation remains uncertain, although it is beyond doubt that the two pages I-DSS3 and I-DSS4, with their rough handwriting, are the first teleological conception of bars 16–37 and 48–78. It is also undeniable that the viola recitative (bars 1–14 and 39–48), absent in these two pages, is inserted only in the subsequent pages I-DSS5 and I-DSS-

---

<sup>22</sup> Because of Mahler's writing mistake and its following corrections, the number 'I' on the page is not clear (it can also be read as 'II'). However, I-DSS3 can only be the first of the DSS, since this page refers to bars 16–37 then refined in I-DSS3, also numbered by the composer as 'I'.

I add that probably at this moment Mahler wrote the title page I-DSS8 with the strange but significant label, '*Adagio/nte*'. As I will explain in detail in Chapter Three, p. 100, it is by this insertion that the traditional sonata scheme with two themes presented on I-DSS3 and I-DSS4 will be 'narrativised' by adding, on I-DSS5 and I-DSS6, a third musical idea, the viola recitative.

Mahler numbers almost all of the subsequent pages, so their position in the chronology of the movement's composition is far more easily deduced than the pages discussed above. Sometimes, however, pages have the same Roman numeral; in most of these cases the most recent one is underlined in red, making it relatively easy to put the following pages in the correct chronology. But particular attention is needed in some cases. Mahler numbers page I-DSS6 with a barely legible '*II*', followed by the single page '*III*' (I-DSS9) containing bars 81–109. Again, Mahler numbered two pages, I-DSS15 and I-DSS16, with '*VI*', both underlined in red. The portrait page I-DSS15 appears to be an earlier stage of composition than I-DSS16; also in this case, the portrait format of the page suggests that it belongs to a pre-draft stage. Here, however, this hypothesis seems even less sustainable than for pages I-DSS3 and I-DSS4. In fact, those pages, as above, could be considered an uninterrupted draft of the movement's opening, lacking the two occurrences of the viola recitative at bars 1–16 and 40–48, which are conceived only on pages I-DSS5, I-DSS6 and I-DSS7. Barring an unlikely future discovery of other manuscript pages conceived in a pre-DSS stage between those pages I-DSS3, I-DSS4 and I-DSS15, it is unthinkable that Mahler conceived during that hypothetical pre-DSS just on this page a precise continuation of the page I-DSS14 belonging to the following compositional stage. For this reason, I-DSS15 seems instead to be an early conception of bars 159–176, and, then, these bars were rewritten in this same stage on I-DSS16.

I-DSS17 and I-DSS19 are numbered by Mahler with '*VII*' underlined in red.—but the

red underscore (and the numeral) on I-DSS17 is cancelled, to indicate that DSS19 is the later one. Both have insertion signs covered respectively by I-DSS18 and I-DSS20, titled by Mahler '*Einlage zu VII*' ('insert of VII').

The SS of the movement presents quite a regular numbering, which corresponds to the OD's performance order. The two pages I-SS9 and I-SS10 were numbered by Mahler with '8', without any underlining in red. In this case, the latter is a rewriting of the former, because of more detailing and the insert required by the former by the word '*Hier!*' ('here') at the end of bar 215. I-SS11 and I-SS12 are both numbered with '9', without any underlining in red; here the latter is clearly a rewriting of bars 253–275 of the former and begins at bar 253, matching the insertion sign of the former. The OD does not present particular problems of chronology, given that Mahler numbered all of its pages.

## 6. Chronology of the Second Movement (Tables 2.6 and 2.7, II, 7–9)

In the second movement's manuscript, there are two clearly recognisable stages: a DSS and an OD. The DSS has loose sheets and pages numbered in Roman numerals and many cancellations and rewritings of passages (see Table 2.6, II, 7–8). The OD has bifolios numbered in Arabic numerals and a clean writing without significant cancellations (see Table 2.7, II, 9). In the DSS, beyond the title page of II-DSS1 '*à la Scherzo*', the beginning of the movement is a significant example of a change to the performance order during the conception of the passage. Following Coburn's reconstruction of the compositional process of the passage (2002, pp. 172–176), three pages present the opening material: II-DSS2, not numbered by Mahler; II-DSS3, which he numbered '*I a*'; and II-DSS5, which he numbered '*I b*'. In Coburn's view, the first page composed was II-DSS2, because in it 'there is no page number' (Coburn, 2002, p. 172). This page, I would add, has the appearance of a (maybe

non-teleological and pre-draft) isolated sketch, referring to the beginning of the piece but without the introductory bars 1–2. According to Coburn (2002, p. 172), then, the following page II-DSS3, referring to bars 1–28, is a rewriting of II-DSS2. I note that this page adds those introductory bars and the bass counter-melody (see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman 2017, 1, p. 35, bars 1–4). According to Coburn (2002, p. 172) after composing this page Mahler numbered it '*I*'. Then he wrote II-DSS4, numbered '*II*', 'since the two last measures of R23 [II-DSS3], subsequently crossed out, show a direct continuation of it' (Coburn, 2002, pp. 172–173). Then he composed II-DSS5, which refers to bars 27–70, and so on this page is a further rewriting of II-DSS2. Although II-DSS5 'appears to be a further refinement and expansion of [material of II-DSS3], the duplication and subsequent crossing-out of the introductory measures show that this originally was Mahler's third attempt at opening rather than a continuation of R23 [II-DSS3]' (Coburn, 2002, p. 173). For this reason, he labelled the page '*I*' and discarded the previous '*I*' page, II-DSS3. Following Coburn's chronology, Mahler readmitted II-DSS3 into the performance order, crossing out the last two bars of this page and the first two bars of II-DSS5, so that the former could continue in the latter, already conceived to continue on II-DSS4. To the number '*I*' of II-DSS3 he then added 'a' and the Arabic number '*I*' at the upper right corner, and 'b' to the '*I*' of II-DSS3. In this textually credible reconstruction, in my perspective, one aspect appears particularly significant: a 'modular' interchangeability of materials which allows the consideration of II-DSS3 and II-DSS5 as the two alternative beginnings of the movement.

Following Mahler's numbering, the next page to be composed was II-DSS6, numbered '*III*', with inserts of bars 142–145 (II-DSS7), and then the other page '*III*' (II-DSS8), a rewriting of the former. Then there is II-DSS9, a rewriting of bars 158–165 of the previous page. The next page numbered by Mahler—the page entitled '*IV Trio a*'—is II-DSS12,

referring to bars 164–215, evidently to follow II-DSS9, stopping at bar 165.

The unnumbered pages II-DSS10 (bars 165–177, 196–249) and II-DSS11 (bars 164–193, 212–224), however, were probably conceived before the page mentioned above ‘*IV Trio a*’ (II-DSS12). This chronology is suggested by the lack of numbering in these pages II-DSS10 and II-DSS11, their crude writing of ideas clearly refined to a version closer to OD on page II-DSS12, ‘*IV Trio a*’ and, on the following page, II-DSS13, labelled by Mahler as ‘*V Trio b*’.

It is more difficult to identify the compositional chronology of the passage in bars 246–409. Here, to complicate the situation, besides the unnumbered pages the numbered ones are sometimes duplicated. According to Coburn (2002, pp. 166–172), however, the pages of the passage can be ordered by considering two attempts at tonal pathways—a transposition of the trio 2 (bars 300–365) and scherzo 3 (bars 366–415) sections (Table 2.8, II, 10).

The first attempt involves page II-DSS14 (without Mahler’s number), in which Mahler conceived bars 246–299 of scherzo 2 and trio 2 (bars 300–306a, 336–365a) —in the keys of F sharp minor/major and G flat major, respectively. This page is entirely refined on II-DSS15, numbered by Mahler with ‘*VI*’, and ends on II-DSS16, numbered by Mahler with ‘*VII*’, where trio 2 ends in G flat major and scherzo 3 is in F sharp minor/major. On II-DSS16 the writing stops in the middle of the page, and verbal annotations (according to Coburn’s deciphering) include ‘*nicht mit Trio Tonika/Hiermit nicht Reprise sondern Seite VI*’<sup>23</sup> and ‘*Scherzo/Lieber her[r] / Mahler/ich weiß*’.<sup>24</sup> Then on II-DSS15, there are the words, ‘*T[rio?] mit Dominante 2. Anhang*’.<sup>25</sup> These inscriptions suggest a change of tonal plan for the two sections in a second attempt. This starts on II-DSS17 (numbered by Mahler

---

<sup>23</sup> ‘Not with Trio Tonic/here not reprise but page VI’

<sup>24</sup> ‘Scherzo/ dear sir /Mahler/I know’.

<sup>25</sup> ‘Trio with dominant 2. supplement’.

‘*VI*’), continues with II-DSS18 (numbered by Mahler ‘*VI a*’) and the first part of II-DSS19 (numbered by Mahler ‘*VI b*’). In the three pages Mahler rewrote bars 246–299 of scherzo 2, expanding that section. On II-DSS19 and II-DSS20 (he numbered with ‘*VI c*’), Mahler rewrote trio 2 (bars 300–365) in D major, and on II-DSS21 (which he numbered ‘*VII*’), bars 366–409 of scherzo 3 (bars 366–415) in F major. I can make the reader aware in advance that these changes of the tonal plan will have a particular implication in my narrative analysis of the movement.

Page II-DSS22, numbered by Mahler as ‘*VIII*’, contains an insertion sign and the word ‘*Einlage*’ (‘insert’) at the end of bar 415, referring to page II-DSS23 (bars 415–457), unnumbered by Mahler, bearing an insertion mark at its beginning. These bars are further rewritten on II-DSS24, labelled by Mahler ‘*Einlage zu VIII*’, and so considered the last page of those bars, also given its more detailed writing.

The OD does not present particular problems of compositional chronology, given that in it almost all the first pages of bifolios were numbered by Mahler, except only for the first bifolio.

## 7. Chronology of the Third and Fourth Movements (Tables 2.9–2.14, II, 11–16)

It is much easier to establish the chronology of the third movement than it is for the other four. Its DSS comprises two pages Mahler did not number. The SS comprises the title page and three pages Mahler numbered with Arabic numerals, containing numerous indications of instruments. The incomplete OD consists of one only page (30 bars), which Mahler numbered with ‘*I*’. The clean writing with few cancellations enables us to put the manuscript pages of the movement in clear performance order.

The compositional materials of the fourth movement comprise two drafts. The second



(from here on I call ‘SD’) is doubtless a refinement of the first (‘FD’), but both have Roman numerals, which Mahler usually used for DSSs, and a significant number of cancellations and rewritings. These features make us think that maybe the second draft, like the first one, is also a DSS and that if he had had time, Mahler would have written an SS and an OD, as he did for the first movement. Concerning the FD, the main problem is that Mahler numbered only seven pages (out of 14), two of which bear the same number (‘VII’). The first page to be written seems to be IV-FD1, which Mahler numbered with ‘I’, which presents bars 5–112 but lacks bars 15–24, 40–46, 57–94. These bars will be progressively added on the following pages IV-FD3 and IV-FD4, which also add bars 113–122. Then IV-FD5 is an insert of bars 57–106a to the previous page IV-FD4. After this page, IV-FD6, which Mahler numbered as ‘IV’, continues from IV-FD4 with bars 123–209 (see Table 2.12, II, 14–15 and 2.13, II, 15). The most puzzling page of the FD is IV-FD2, (see Fig. 6.1, II, 142; Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, pp. 94, 99, 107–109). According to Bouwman (Mahler-Bouwman 3, 2017, 3, p. 39), this page follows IV-FD1, because the initial bars (113–114a) of the former continue the last bar (112) of the latter. However, on the same page after a gap in the writing, on the lower stave systems in an almost continuous passage are groups of bars (174–180, 286a–317 and 320–323) located in the SD in different parts of the movement. This fragmentary aspect of the writing of these bars may lead us to think that this page is non-teleological and that Mahler conceived it in a pre-draft stage. If it is beyond doubt that the page represents the earliest version of the bars indicated above, however, it is necessary to establish whether it was conceived in or before the FD. The continuity of bars 113–114a, with the previous page IV-FD1 and, above all, their minor harmonic completeness compared to the same (cancelled) bars of IV-FD5<sup>26</sup> suggest that these bars were conceived at the FD

---

<sup>26</sup> See Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, p. 94.

stage, after IV-FD1. The remaining bars of the page (174–180, 286a–317 and 320–323), then, probably were conceived not before bars 113–114a but in the same work session or immediately after having written them. This hypothesis is further supported by the fact that bars 174–180 on IV-FD2 appear to be an earlier version of the same bars on IV-FD6 which, because of Mahler’s numbering, seems almost certainly conceived later than IV-FD1.

Mahler’s regular numbering of pages with ‘IV’ or ‘V’ does not seem to suggest chronological problems. But page ‘VI’ (IV-FD8) deserves particular attention. It consists of two parts, separated graphically, and this suggests that Mahler did not conceive them in a performance continuity. The first part is cancelled and contains a rewriting of bars 244–247 of page IV-FD7, which leads into bars 287–311 and the discarded bar 311a. The second part, like the first, presents a rewriting of bars 244–247 and bars 248–282.

Mahler then cancelled the upper part of IV-FD8, continued its lower part on IV-FD9 with bars 283–286 and, and on this page, rewrote bars 286–311 of the cancelled upper part of IV-FD8. IV-FD9 is followed by IV-FD10 and IV-FD11, which are early versions of IV-FD12, the only page of the three Mahler numbered, ‘VII’. This explains the verbal remainder on IV-FD8, ‘*Fortsetzung s a VII*’ (‘continuation [to] VII’),<sup>27</sup> placed at the beginning of that cancelled part of IV-FD8, a note that obviously can also refer to the version on page IV-FD9. Page IV-FD13, which Mahler numbered as ‘VIII’, containing bars 366–383, continues IV-FD12 (bars 312–365a). Then IV-FD14, which Mahler did not number, refers to bars 410–459 and 478–512; the ‘missing’ passages between and within IV-FD13/14 were supplied in the SD.

---

<sup>27</sup> Bouwman (Mahler-Bouwman 3, 2017, p. 39) considers IV-FD9 as ‘early VII’, given Mahler’s page number. Actually, this number was probably written by mistake and then cancelled (as is evident in the manuscript page) after having numbered IV-FD12.

Mahler numbered the SD (Table 2.14, II, 16) regularly, so it is quite easy to discern the order of conception of these pages. Some problems, however, occur with page ‘VIII’ having many cancellations—which, according to Bouwman (3, 2017, p. 40), contains bars (380–397, 398–507) that Mahler rewrote on pages ‘IX’ and ‘IXa’.

## 8. Chronology of the Fifth Movement (Table 2.15 II, 17–18)

The manuscript of the fifth movement progressed no further than an SS numbered by Mahler with Arabic numbers. The absence of loose sheets until page V-SS7, which Mahler numbered ‘5’, poses no problems of chronology of composition. An intriguing chronological problem, however, is posed by two loose sheets that contain mainly discarded bars. The first one, V-SS10, Mahler numbered with ‘5 ½’, and the second, V-SS8, he numbered with ‘6’. This progressive numeration indicates a clear performance order of the two pages. Coburn observes, however, that V-SS10 ‘seems to be a sketch page since it does not continue the music of short score p. 5 and is in an entirely different key’ (Coburn, 2002, p. 57). He adds (Coburn, 2002, p. 57) that ‘R 52 [V-SS8], on the other hand, continues the short score p. 5 smoothly and is an earlier version of [...] page 6’ (V-SS9). I observe that the initial bars of V-SS8 are in the same key, A flat major, which has four flats indicated by the key signature after the last bar of V-SS10 (see Fig. 7.2, II, 183, oval 2). This aspect, and the strange numeration of V-SS10—‘5 1/2’—lead Coburn (2002, p. 57) to think that Mahler, after having composed pages ‘5’ (V-SS7) and ‘6’ (V-SS8), then ‘6’ (V-SS9), wrote V-SS10, labelled as ‘5 1/2’ (given that Mahler had already used numbers ‘5’ and ‘6’), as a passage preceding page ‘6’ (V-SS8). Not satisfied with the result, Mahler then entirely discarded V-SS10 and many bars on V-SS8 and even on page ‘6’ (V-SS9).

Another problem is posed by page V-SS14, which looks like a typical sketch, given its non-teleological fragmentary character. It is evident, however, that Mahler conceived this

page during the draft stage as incomplete attempt and then rewrote this page on V-SS15, numbered '8', as the insert (bars 299–314) required at the end of bar 298 of V-SS11. It seems likely that the composer conceived V-SS14 after the early attempt of the piece's finale in B flat major at pages V-SS12, numbered by Mahler '8', and V-SS13, unnumbered by Mahler. So from V-SS14 Mahler wrote a new finale transposed in F sharp major and enlarged on pages V-SS15, V-SS16 and V-SS17, which he numbered as '8', '9' and '10', respectively. Again, concerning this first finale, page V-SS13 is intended as a continuation of the first of the pages Mahler numbered with '8', V-SS12.

## 9. The Tenth's Creative Process through Letters and Testimonies

The last stage of the compositional history tracked in this chapter is the collocation of the Symphony's compositional process on a timeline within Mahler's biography. All secondary sources agree in placing the composition of this work within a short period in the last year of Mahler's life, between June and September 1910, when Mahler's family experienced a dramatic summer. This brief period of composition was further shortened by two interruptions caused by an unexpected personal crisis I will detail below. The available time came in three highly productive sessions of no more than twenty days in total, in which Mahler composed the numerous pages of the unfinished manuscript of the Symphony. As a result, Henry-Louis de La Grange (2008, p. 1453) suspects that before writing the surviving material, Mahler had likely prepared preliminary sketches, maybe in a notebook. Unfortunately, no such document has survived. Without further supporting evidence, this is no more than conjecture—though it has some credibility, given Mahler's habit of beginning a work's compositional process with a non-teleological stage of sketching in a notebook, as in the Seventh and Ninth symphonies. Within the existing manuscript material, then, the

pages written in a non-teleological pre-draft stage may be the tip of the iceberg of a pre-draft stage, the majority of which has not survived.

Based on documentary evidence, the compositional history of the Tenth begins in July 1910. On 4 July Mahler arrived in Toblach, his summer residence, having visited his wife, Alma, in Tobelbad, where she stayed for spa treatments. Composition of the Tenth likely began between this arrival day and 18 July, the date of the arrival postmark of Mahler's undated letter to his publisher, Emil Hertzka. In it he wrote: '*Jedoch bitte ich mit diesem Geschäft sich bis zum September zu gedulden, da ich eben jetzt etwas Anderes machen muß*' ('I beg you to be patient with this business until September, because I have to do something different now', BSB Ana 600 B, I, 2, b, translation mine).<sup>28</sup>

If, as Jörg Rothkamm (2003, p. 38) asserts, that sentence is a clue that Mahler at that date had begun writing the Tenth, then there is less certainty about when he actually began composing. Two things, however, narrow it down and give precious information about the dynamics of the compositional process. First, before Mahler's arrival in Toblach, he had not planned to compose a new symphony. In fact, in a letter to Alma (GMAB, 2004, no. 315, p. 366), he wrote to her not to expect a new symphony. Second, Mahler's intense correspondence around his birthday, 7 July, conveying greetings and thanks but also comments about professional duties, make us think that he did not have enough time and concentration to compose. In a letter (GMAB, 2004, no. 317, p. 436) from Mahler to Alma, we know that by 5 July Mahler had not entered his composing hut, which he used exclusively for composing. Thus, according to Rothkamm (2002, p. 38), the Tenth's composition

---

<sup>28</sup> For the numerous quotations and references of this section to unpublished letters like this, I rely on Rothkamm's book on Mahler's Tenth (2003), the first essay to consider them in tracking the genesis of this work. In drawing upon the primary sources, Rothkamm provides the most compelling account of the Symphony's genesis.

could have begun just before Alma's arrival in Toblach, which, according to de La Grange's (2008, p. 839) assumption, happened on 16 July. Alma (AME, 1940/1946, p. 173), revealed that when she was still in Tobelbad Mahler 'began sketching out his Tenth Symphony'. So, the compositional process presumably continued until a first interruption Rothkamm (2002, pp. 39–42) identifies as 29 July to 7 August, the days of the climax of Mahler's 'family novel'.

According to Alma's memoir (AME 1940/1946, p. 173), during her stay in Tobelbad she met a young German architect—Walter Gropius—with whom she soon initiated a love affair. Before Alma's departure from Tobelbad, they agreed that he would send his letters to her to the Toblach poste restante,<sup>29</sup> but he, perhaps deliberately, addressed one of his passionate love letters to 'Herr Director Mahler' (AME, 1940/1946, p. 173). From Alma's expression in a letter to Gropius ('*Sonntag*' ['Sunday'], [31.7.1910]) '*vorgestrigen Abend*', 'the evening before yesterday'), Rothkamm (2003, p. 39) presumes that this episode occurred on 29 July.

In the following days after reading Gropius's letter, Mahler's jealousy had destructive effects on his psyche. Alma relates that

I often woke in the night and found him standing at my bedside in the darkness, and started as at the apparition of a departed spirit. I had to fetch him from his studio every day for meals. I did so very cautiously. He was often lying on the floor weeping in his dread that he might lose me, had lost me perhaps already. On the floor, he said, he was nearer to the earth. (AME, 1940/1946, p. 173)

---

<sup>29</sup> Rothkamm (2003, p. 39) testifies to this agreement with some letters written from Toblach by Alma to Gropius: '*Montag*' ['Monday'], 1[8].7.1910, '*Montag Abend*' ['Monday evening'], sent on 1 [9] .7.1910, '*Sonntag Nacht*', ['Sunday night'] sent on 25.07.1910, '*Donnerstag*' ['Thursday'], 2 [8].7.1910'.

The following events apparently concluded the marital conflict and Mahler's brutal psychological shock. At that time, according to Alma (1940/1946, p. 174), Gropius came to Toblach—according to Rothkamm (2003, p. 40), on 4 or 5 August. He spoke with Mahler, who later asked Alma to decide about the future of their marriage. She chose to stay with her husband (AME, 1940/1946, p. 175).

The continuation of the compositional work can be inferred from Alma's letter to Gropius of 8 August. She wrote, '[...] *heute ist der erste Tag and dem Mahler in sein kleines Arbeitshus gegangen ist wir füllen es alle als eine große Freude*' ('[...] Today is the first day in which Gustav went into his working hut we all feel it as a great joy').<sup>30</sup> Given Mahler's habit of working exclusively in the hut, Rothkamm (2003, pp. 38–42) assumes that during the period from the discovery of the misaddressed letter (29 July) to the return to the composing hut, Mahler suspended his work, due to the marital crisis.

After Gropius's departure, then, Mahler was reconciled with his wife and seemed to have returned to his usual productivity. A guilty conscience towards Alma, however, led him to re-evaluate his wife's compositional talent.<sup>31</sup> On 9 August, Mahler asked Alma for the first time to play for him her songs, according to AME (1940/1946, p. 176).<sup>32</sup> Mahler greatly appreciated them and proposed that they revise them together.<sup>33</sup> These songs doubtless included the 'Erntelied', quoted in the Tenth's third movement, given that a manuscript of this Lied, with Mahler's corrections, has survived.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Alma's letter to Gropius, 'Montag' ['Monday'], 8. [8.]1910, translation mine.

<sup>31</sup> An echo of this feeling is in the title of the third movement, 'Purgatorio', and in the verbal notes of the Tenth's last three movements. See AME, 1940/1946, p. 175.

<sup>32</sup> According to Rothkamm (2003, p. 44) this is testified by a sentence in a letter from Alma to Gropius, from Toblach, 'Mittwoch' ['Wednesday'], 10.8.1910, 'Gustav bat mich gestern, ihm Lieder von mir vorzuspielen—Ich that es' ('Gustav asked me yesterday to play for him my lieder—I did it', translation mine).

<sup>33</sup> AME, p. 207, GMAB, 323, pp. 447 and 535 and also the letter from Alma to Gropius from Toblach, 'Mittwoch' ['Wednesday'], 17 [8] 1910.

<sup>34</sup> The Lied's manuscripts are stored in the Fonds La Grange of the Médiathèque Musicale Mahler in Paris, shelf-marks: Alma-ms1-004 and Alma-ms1-005.

In a letter from Alma to Gropius, dated 14 August, she wrote that Mahler ‘*eine ganze Symphonie gemacht hat*’ (‘has composed an entire symphony’), and this doubtless testifies to an advanced state of the work’s completion.<sup>35</sup> The compositional work was moving forward on 17 August when Alma, in another letter to Gropius, wrote that Mahler was still in the composing hut.<sup>36</sup> Mahler’s psychological suffering is attested to by a series of letters and notes (GMAB, 2004, pp. 375–381), some of which are in verse, to express an emphatic sentimentalism towards Alma. This psychical pain was evident also to himself, and ‘he realized that he had lived the life of a neurotic’, so that he ‘suddenly decided to consult Sigmund Freud’ (AME, 1940/1946, p. 175).

Rothkamm (2003, pp. 46–49) surmises another interruption of the Tenth’s compositional process from 22 to 26 August. In fact, on 22 August Mahler fell ill with angina<sup>37</sup> but recovered in time to leave for Leyden Holland on 25 August<sup>38</sup> to make a previously scheduled appointment with Freud, who was there on holiday.<sup>39</sup> On 26 August there was a lengthy psychoanalytic session with Freud, finishing just before 7.40 p.m., as per Mahler’s telegram to Alma (GMAB, 2004, no. 335, p. 380). So, probably he had no time to work that same day. According to Rothkamm (2003, p. 49), he worked on the train during the return trip, on 27 August. This, because on that day he wrote a letter in verse whose words ‘Zusammen floss zu einem einzigen Akkord / Mein zagend Denken und mein brausend Fühlen’,<sup>40</sup> seems to allude to the nine-tone chord of the climactic episode presented in the first and the fifth movements, at bars 194–212 and 275–283, respectively. As Rothkamm

---

<sup>35</sup> Alma’s letter to Gropius ‘*Sonntag*’ [‘Sunday’], [14] .8.1910 from Toblach.

<sup>36</sup> ‘*Mittwoch*’ [‘Wednesday’], 17. [8]. 1910, from Toblach.

<sup>37</sup> Alma’s letter to Gropius, ‘*Dienstag*’ [‘Tuesday’] [23.8.1910] from Toblach.

<sup>38</sup> Alma’s letter to Gropius [26.8.1910]

<sup>39</sup> The return trip is tracked by telegrams and letters from Mahler to Alma on the way (GMAB, 2004, pp. 378–381).

<sup>40</sup> In one single chord my hesitant notion / converges with the power of my searing emotions’ (translation by Antony Beaumont in GMAB, 2004, p. 381, no. 339).



notes (2003, p. 6), it seems likely that Mahler worked on the Tenth on the following days in Toblach, at least until midday on 3 September, when he left for Munich for a rehearsal and the premiere of the Eighth; so he probably had no time to work on the Tenth. Rothkamm (2003, pp. 49–53) excludes the possibility that Mahler could have worked on the Symphony from 3 September to the date of his death, 18 May 1911, because of the lack of documentary evidence and logical supporting clues.

In the framework of this biographical account, it is necessary to understand which parts of the composition Mahler completed during each of the presumed three periods (6–17 July to 28 July, 8–21 August, 27 August–3 September). On the largest scale, a chronological division is evident from the fact that the manuscripts of the first and second movements, contrary to the third, fourth and fifth, do not have the dramatic annotations referring to Mahler's suffering. According to a first conjectural chronology of movements, the last three movements should be placed after Gropius's letter read by Mahler on 29 July, and, consequently, the first two movements before that date in the first period.

Through a textual analysis of the work, however, Rothkamm (2003, pp. 54–60) also identifies a more detailed chronology considering two topical passages of the Symphony. The first focus is on the above-mentioned climactic passage, including the nine-tone chord in the first and fifth movements. This episode is absent in the DSS of the first movement and was added as an afterthought in the SS. In particular, on page I-SS8, bars 205–207 (containing this nine-tone chord) were added in the later revision, as revealed by the fact that Mahler wrote with his own hand the staves of bars 205–207. Rothkamm thinks (2003, p. 55) that bars 205–207 were actually conceived later, during the composition of the fifth movement (see below). Only after this conception did Mahler return to the SS (I-SS8) of the first movement and add these bars, cancelling the first bar of the beginning of the fourth stave and adding chords at bars 196–198 (given that they appear to have a different thickness

of pencil stroke).

According to Rothkamm (2003, p. 55), in the fifth movement the conception of this chord in bars 275–283 is signalled by the words of the letter–poem of 27 August: ‘Zusammen floss zu einem einzigen Akkord / Mein zagend Denken und mein brausend Fühlen’,<sup>41</sup> where the word ‘brausend’ (‘searing’) alludes to the rapid figures of the passage. It is an impulsive, unprepared expression of a disturbed mood whose fatalism is connoted religiously by the fact that this chord contains all the pitches of the passage of the ‘Purgatorio’ movement (bars 113–115), and an inscription quotes Matthew’s gospel (27.46 and 6.10): ‘*Dein Wille geschehe!*’ (‘Thy will be done’). In a more precise dating of this chord, Rothkamm (2003, pp. 58–59) establishes that Mahler likely conceived it on the train during the return trip from Leyden, when he wrote the above letter–poem.

A significant support presented by Rothkamm (2003, p. 56) for this chord’s having been conceived during the composition of the fifth movement is the discarded page V-SS10, the earliest sketch of this passage, then rewritten and developed in bars 275–283. Rothkamm (2003, p. 58) further supports Mahler’s purpose in linking the first and the fifth movements by the transposition of bars 315–400 of the fifth movement from B flat major to F sharp major (the key of the first movement), and a motivic reminiscence in the recapitulatory section of the fifth of the first.

The second focus of Rothkamm’s chronology is in the third movement, entitled ‘Purgatorio’. Its quotation of Alma’s ‘Erntelied’ (in the second section of the movement, bars 64–121) makes him think (2003, p. 58) that Mahler conceived that passage on the day he proofread that Lied, 9 August. As a result, the previous section of the movement (bars 1–63) would have been composed on the previous day, 8 August, the first day of Mahler’s

---

<sup>41</sup> GMAB, 2004, p. 381, no. 339.

return to the composing hut, as in Alma's letter, mentioned earlier. It will be clear also from my following analysis (Chapters Three to Seven) that the fourth and fifth movements develop materials of Purgatorio and share a teleology; possibly Mahler drafted them with the conception of this movement in the second period of composition.

In Rothkamm's chronology (2003, pp. 57–59), after the conception of the nine-tone chord passage in the SSs of the fifth and first movements on 27 August, on the following days until 3 September Mahler probably worked on completing the final part of the fifth movement and the SS of the first movement. In addition, from 28 August (at the earliest) to 3 September he worked on the orchestration of the first, second and third movements (until bar 30).

## 10. 'The Quill Is in my Hand'

To conclude this chapter, the historical reconstruction through letters and testimonies needs to be complemented with my focus, not yet applied, on the perspective of Mahler's 'narrative impulse' as theoretically outlined in Chapter One. In this view, particular attention should be given to letters, notes and telegrams from Mahler addressed to Alma (GMAB, 2004, nos. 323–339, pp. 375–381). Some of these are dated in a time span from 17 August to 27 August 1910. Others are undated, but from their content it seems that they were written during that same period when Mahler wrote the third, fourth and fifth movements and conceived the nine-tone chord. Mahler's writings follow his reconciliation with his wife and contain—in some cases, even in verse—an overemphatic and almost deliriously passionate expression of love towards Alma. But there are also lucid, authorial purposes and 'incontrovertible clues to the progress' of the Symphony (GMAB, 2004, p. 376).

I would add more specifically that they describe both the compositional process of the Symphony and the teleological plot of the piece—two dimensions which, in Mahler's

inspiration, evidently tend to correspond meta-referentially. In this way, the poem (GMAB, 2004, no. 329) dated by Alma ‘17 August 1910’, is illuminating: ‘Die Zeit is da, die Feder ist zur Hand / Doch die Gedanken wollen nicht verweilen’ (‘The time is come, the quill is in my hand / Yet this idea continually eludes me’<sup>42</sup>). In these verses, according to de La Grange Weiss (GMAB, 2004, p. 376), Mahler is saying that at the moment of beginning to write the work, he ‘had not yet experienced the moment of intuition akin to the “sound of oars playing through the water” which had inspired the opening of the Seventh Symphony’ (GMAB, 2004, p. 376), in spite of his strong inspirational impulse. ‘Und was mein Herz auch singt und dringt / es schweifen all Sinne in die Runde!’ (‘No matter what my heart desires or sings / My senses rove and wander without aim’<sup>43</sup>). But, finally, the moment of inspiration arrived in this programmatic stanza: ‘Zusammenfassen will ich alle Schauer meiner Lust, / der Gotteswonne Ewigkeit an ihrer Brust / zu einer Melodie, die wie der Sonnebogen / den Himmel ihrer Holdheit kühn durchzogen’ (‘I want to condense the tremors in my yearning, / Th’eternity of bliss divine in your embrace, / Into one melody that, like the sun a-burning, / Illuminates the beauty of your face’<sup>44</sup>).

It seems clear that these words can be read not only at a level of the work’s compositional process but also at a level of transition from ‘process’ to ‘product’—that is, the piece’s teleological plot, recalling here MacCallum (2009). For this purpose, I can mention two key points of the Symphony. The first is in the first movement, where the introduction–refrain recitative (bars 1–14) in its uncertain tonally ambiguous and chromatic melody seems to represent the ‘quill’ of Mahler in his effort to overcome his writing block and searching for

---

<sup>42</sup> Translation by Beaumont in GMAB, 2004, p. 377.

<sup>43</sup> Translation by Beaumont in GMAB, 2004, p. 377.

<sup>44</sup> Translation by Beaumont in GMAB, 2004, p. 377 (with my modification, for the sake of better adherence to the German original text. The words ‘I want to’ replace ‘Let Me’ and ‘one melody’, ‘one great song’ in the original translation).

that idea which eludes him. The second point is at the end of the fifth movement (bars 299–400) when this idea finally arrives. Here in fact this same introduction–refrain introduces the last and longest occurrence of a theme based on Alma’s ‘Erntelied’ quotations in the third movement and which seems to be that ‘one melody’ mentioned in the above-quoted letter.

According to the Symphony’s compositional history, by the date of this letter–poem (17 August 1910) Mahler had already written the majority of the surviving pages but not the nine-tone chord episode in the first and fifth movements. So the above-quoted verses ‘will ich, Zusammenfassen [...] / zu einer Melodie [...]’ can testify the intention of writing the longest occurrence of the melodic Alma’s theme in the fifth movement (bars 299–400), after the nine-note chord episode (bars 267–298), conceived, according to Rothkamm’s chronology, not before 27 August. Likewise, this narrative of searching for inspiration can be read not only concerning the following conception of those bars of the fifth movement, but also, retrospectively, in relation to the impasse of the first movement, already written. So I hypothesise that this letter-poem is the revelation to Alma of the entire Symphony’s plot, which wants to present the ‘narrative’ of that same work’s compositional process.

Mahler’s relationship to writing, in light of Barthes’s ‘Death of the Author’, is indicated by the use of the word ‘Hand’ in this poem, and above all in the letter dated by Alma ‘17 August’ (GMAB, 2004, p. 378, no. 330). Here, in a co-mingling of life and art, Mahler speaks directly to his hand, intended with almost ‘agential’ terms, as an autonomous entity detached from him— ‘Du süsse Hand, die mich gebunden!’ (‘Oh sweetest hand that ever held me’). Here the bond is that of pervasive and incessant writing which is identifiable with the same life, springing up from his wounds in the final verse: ‘O Leben—spriesse auf aus

meinem Wunden!’ (‘Spring-up, o life-force, from my wounds’<sup>45</sup>).

The letter numbered 339 in GMAB (2008, p. 381), which Mahler wrote to his wife on 27 August from Amsterdam, probably from the train, is highly significant intertextually. In it, in addition to the reference to the nine-tone chord, highlighted by Rothkamm, is the highly significant sentence ‘Ich starb der Welt’ (‘I’m dead to the world’), an allusion to the line ‘Ich bin gestorben dem Weltgetümmel’ of the Lied ‘Ich bin der Welt abhanden gekommen’.

A more significant reference, via these words, can be to the Fifth Symphony’s Adagietto and the last part of the final movement of that Symphony, both coming from that Lied. In fact, the reference to this Lied cannot be casual, and these words indicate a deliberate intention to link these previous works with the in-progress Tenth. That sentence takes on this sense if one is analysing the works and realises that only in the Tenth did Mahler want to establish a ‘genetic’ pathway from the Lied to the Symphony in a similar way, although in the opposite direction to that of these previous works.

I commented in Chapter One, pp. 35–36, that in the Fifth Symphony the subjective monologic lyricism of the Lied is overcome dialectically through the Lied’s quotation in the chorale by the narrative polyphony of the finale. Here, as in the Fifth Symphony, Mahler starts a process of symphonic elaboration of a Lied—Alma’s ‘Erntelied’—from its quotations in the third movement. In contrast to the Fifth, however, from those quotations in the Tenth Mahler wants to return to the monologic lyricism of the Lied genre in the lengthy melody of the fifth movement’s finale. In this sense, we must read the words of the same poem, ‘life melody rising from sorrow and pain’. Here the words ‘sorrow’ and ‘pain’ perhaps allude to the fireman’s funeral episode, stylised in the fourth and fifth movements, but also to the omnipresent rhythmical excitement (the Adornian ‘*Weltlauf*’), which stops

---

<sup>45</sup> Translation by Beaumont in GMAB, 2004, p. 378.

only with the arrival of that melody.

To conclude, according to these statements, Mahler's narrative impulse appears to be an incessant process of searching for a liberating lyric memory, through what Kinderman (2006) defines as 'teleological genesis', in terms of 'process within a product'. From this perspective, then, the task of the next chapters is to explain the narrative strategies that achieve this 'teleological genesis', showing how they work in the compositional process.

# Chapter Three. Narrativity and Narrativisation in the First Movement

In the two previous chapters, I have shown the historical-cultural and biographical-personal context of the creative act of Mahler's Tenth Symphony. With this chapter I begin my three-stage analysis of the text, including all preparatory materials. I will employ my 'genetic' apparatus of analysis of narrativity by using theories from Micznik (2001)—and, through her, Barthes (1977) and Genette (1972/1980)—and Almén (2008). In the framework of these theories, I will use notions from previous analyses of Mahler's Tenth by Coburn (2002), Rothkamm (2003) and other authors, and I will apply to this movement Samuels's intuitions on diegetic temporal slippages implied by Mahler's style-borrowings. In this way, I will corroborate my construct: the existence, during the compositional process, of narrativisation and, behind it, of a composer's communicative intention (in Eco's terms, the 'intentio auctoris', detectable from the 'intentio operis').

In sections 1 and 2 I will analyse the last compositional stage (an OD) of the existing manuscript movement materials by using my analytical apparatus. In sections 3–6, within each of the movement's large formal areas (exposition, development and recapitulation, climax, coda), I will apply my analytical technique to all existing materials from the earliest sketches to the OD. I can infer the process of narrativisation, considering the changes during the compositional process. In section 7 I will then reunite the analytic outcomes of the previous stages in a narrative interpretation of the overall movement.



## 1. The Analysis of the ‘Story’ Level<sup>46</sup>

In this section I argue that at the paradigmatic ‘story’ level, the movement’s basic musical ideas—thanks to their morpho-syntactic and semantic autonomy—are comparable to narrative events. These ideas, presented in II, are:

- an introduction–refrain, which I call ‘*Event x*’ (first presented in bars 1–15<sup>47</sup>, Ex. 3.1, II, 20);<sup>48</sup>
- a theme I call ‘*Event a*’ (first presented in bars 16–31, Ex. 3.2, II, 21);
- a second theme, which I name ‘*Event b(x)*’,<sup>49</sup> presented first in bars 32–38 (Ex. 3.3, II, 22);
- a small motive I label as ‘*Event y*’, presented first in bars 27–31 (Ex. 3.4, II, 23) as a part of *Event a*, and at bar 34 as a part of the theme *Event b(x)*;
- a climax section, ‘*Event c*’ (bars 194–212, Ex. 3.5, II, 24–25), composed of the ideas ‘*Event c1*’ and ‘*Event c2*’ (bars 194–198 and bars 203–212, respectively), and in between, the return of *Event y* (bars 199–202).

(For the most important occurrences of these events see Exs. 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, II, 26–29<sup>50</sup>).

---

<sup>46</sup> An earlier version of a part this chapter was published as Pinto (2017).

<sup>47</sup> From this point on in this chapter and in the subsequent chapters, the bar numbering refers to Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017.

<sup>48</sup> Some of my labels (*a*, *b(x)*) for the movement’s musical events are borrowed from Kofi V. Agawu’s essay (1986). In my intentions the initial letters *a*, *b*, *c* of the alphabet indicate musical ideas having the nature of main themes, while letters *x*, *y* label secondary musical ideas. The numbers put after ‘*Event c*’ designate the occurrences of this event.

<sup>49</sup> Following Agawu (1986), I use the letter *x* in parentheses to indicate the morphologic similarity of this musical idea with *Event x*.

<sup>50</sup> These tables and those of the same kind in the following chapters are taken (with modifications) from Rothkamm (2003). With them, this author makes for each movement a distributional motivic inventory, based on a taxonomic affiliation of motives by their morphological similarity. This approach works well in my

The critical aspects of *Event x*'s narrative status are its tonal ambiguity/chromaticism. These features of this musical idea, noticed by all previous commentators, are quite unusual in Mahler's music. The key signature of bars 1–15 (six sharps) may be a misleading clue to the harmonic analysis of the passage. The altered notes of the opening bars 1–7 (indicated with asterisks in Ex. 3.1, II, 20) could make us ascribe this musical idea to the key of B minor, also given the presence in these bars, 1–3, of the tonic triad B–D–F sharp. Even this harmonic label, however, seems problematic, given the presence in this event of notes ascribable to F sharp major: E sharp in bar 1, and A sharp in bars 3 and 6. Moreover, because of the descending motion in both bars, A sharp can be hardly seen as the leading note of B minor.

From a Schenkerian perspective, then, Peter Bergquist (1980, p. 343) in his analysis emphasizes the pivotal role in the melodic structure of these bars of long-lasting notes of the F sharp major triad (F sharp–A sharp–C sharp, indicated with arrows in Ex. 3.1, II, 20). The triad of G major (the notes G–B–D, circled in Ex. 3.1, II, 20) at bars 1–2 also plays a similarly pivotal role. Thus, Richard Kaplan (1981, p. 31), again from a Schenkerian viewpoint, asserts that 'the operation of a G major/B minor complex [...] governs the first five measures'. After these initial seven bars 1–7 the key (read enharmonically) of B flat major (bars 7–15, Ex. 3.1, II, 20, square 1) is suggested through a chromatic shift, unusual in Mahler's music, at bar 7 (F sharp–F natural, see Ex. 3.1, II, 20, square 2). However, within this new key, further tonal ambiguity is conveyed by the note G sharp, that even if read as A flat does not belong to that key B flat major and lasts through the entire bar 10.

Over these problematic tonal aspects, *Event x* has features of irregularity and non-rhythmicisation which facilitate its recognisability as autonomous, 'purely gestural' and

---

perspectives and corresponds almost entirely with Micznik's paradigmatic plane of the events (in this movement) or with their smaller constituent units (in the second, third, fourth and fifth movements).

self-contained. More specifically, this idea in its lack of thematic/melodic directionality seems to have the morphological and gestural uncertainty of a classical symphony's introductory Adagio. But this event at bars 1–14 and 40–48 is faster (Andante) than Adagio that comes in between, and within the movement it introduces the other basic units (*Event a*, *Event b(x)*, *Event y* and *Event c*) in turn. Concerning its gestural features—texture, tempo—and its tonal ambiguity/chromaticism, *Event x* has a physiognomy contrasting with the movement's other basic musical ideas that *Event x* introduces. This aspect seems to put this event in another, meta-referential, plane of the 'discourse', like that of the slow introduction of a classical symphony, drawing the listener's attention to the movement that is going to be performed. By contrast—and unlike a classical symphony's introductory Adagio, which is morphologically different from the movement it precedes—*Event x* subtly anticipates motives and cells, as some authors have noted,<sup>51</sup> and works rather like a *Vorspiel* of a Wagnerian music drama.

Coburn's motivic analysis (2002, p. 87) suggests that *Event x* contains all four basic cells of the movement, and even of the entire Symphony (Ex. 3.10, II, 30–31, cells 1–4).<sup>52</sup> So the two themes of the movement, *Event a* and *Event b(x)* contain *Event x*'s cells 3 and 4 and 1 and 4, respectively, and *Event y* has *Event x*'s cell 1. Another important feature of *Event x* is its lack of huge morphological changes between its occurrences during the movement. Because, as Peter Bergquist states, it 'is so integral to the movement, it is not surprising that [*Event x*] recurs more or less literally at bars 39, 105, 185' (Bergquist, 1980, p. 346). The great morphological difference between this idea and the others suggests they belong to different 'cultural units' (to use Almén's terms I explained on p. 16): tonal

---

<sup>51</sup> In this direction, see Bergquist (1980, p. 346), and also Agawu (1986, p. 226).

<sup>52</sup> Bergquist also confirms this nature of *x*. He notices that this idea contains the melodic relationship A# (+3) to G x or A (-3), which is 'one of the most basic melodic relationships in the entire movement, since it governs the interchange F# major and minor' (1980, p. 346).

ambiguity/chromaticism on the one hand, and an enlarged diatonicism on the other. So these features, again in Almén's terms, are the premise, at an 'agential level', of this idea's 'actorial' status, which I will explore further when talking about the 'discourse level'.

The other basic musical ideas are characterised by a greater regularity, symmetry and thematic identity compared to *Event x*. Despite this, however, they seem affected by a logic of omission, recovery and displacement of materials. These are all aspects which confer to these ideas not only a morphological variability and unpredictability in their occurrence but also, and most importantly for my purposes, gestural individualisation. In this view, at least in the exposition, *Event a* is the only idea of the movement that we can define as a 'theme', according to classical sonata form's conventional thematic discursive completeness and fluency. Consequently, its harmonic pathway in the key of F sharp major is more clearly tonally defined, and its periodic construction seems clear and apparently quite regular. In spite of these features, however, this theme subtly presents some significant breaks in its morphological continuity, which make the morphology of this musical idea less regular and predictable. In bars 27–31 (Ex. 3.4, II, 23), for example, the arrival of a morphologically differentiated idea, *Event y*, forbids a continuation of the previously uninterrupted thematic 'discourse' of bars 16–27. This continuation happens only in the second occurrence (bars 49–80), where the idea reaches more fluent thematic completeness. Here there is no 'displacement' by *Event y*, and the presentation of *Event a* comprises two complete periods (bars 49–57 and 58–80) in an uninterrupted thematic fluency.

This morphological continuity of the exposition will not be achieved again by *Event a* in the rest of the movement. In fact, in the recapitulation, according to sonata form conventions, an initial discursive continuity of the two themes should be restored after the fragmentariness of the development. But at this moment of the movement, one of these two themes, *Event a*, does not reclaim its fluency and its presentations are more fragmentary

than in the exposition. This logic of a narrative displacement is also significantly revealed by harmonic analysis of *Event a*. Bergquist (1980, p. 8) notes in the theme a general ‘use of delay and vertical [harmonic] displacement throughout the movement’.

By applying to Mahler’s music an opinion attributed to Proust, Adorno asserts that ‘in music new themes sometimes take over the centre in the same way as previously unnoticed minor characters in novels’ (Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 71). In this statement, I think Adorno might have been referring to ideas such as *Event y*. In fact, the morphological ‘anthropomorphic’ evolution of this idea during the movement qualifies it as an ‘agent’. The first occurrences of this motive, *Event y*, confer on it a secondary (but oppositional) role of the above-mentioned premature conclusion of *Event a* (bars 27–31) and *Event b(x)* (bars 36–38). This interruptive function happens because in these two passages *Event y* already stands out from these two themes with its shorter note values (semiquavers) and for its greater symmetrical melodic–rhythmic pattern.

The evolution of this idea also confers to it a morphological autonomy allowing it to take over the centre in the sense of the Adornian quotation above. So, during the movement, *Event y* assumes a clear, autonomous role and acts as an individualised unit working independently of the two themes. Thus, both for its high number of occurrences in the movement and also in terms of increasing duration, this motive assumes the role of a refrain—a counterpart, in its more defined morphological profile, to the other iterative idea, *Event x*. At bar 34, within the second occurrence of *Event y*, a motive characterised by a trill is presented (Ex. 3.11, II, 32; from here on I will call this the ‘trill-motive’). This motive is presented again many times but is always associated with *Event y*, to compose an altogether gesturally unique ‘fliessend’ idea.

The second theme, *Event b(x)*, is the musical idea melodically most similar to *Event x*. Some other authors claim this affinity—e.g. Rothkamm (2003, p. 82)—considering these

ideas as two occurrences of the same theme. In my view, however, the melodic profile is the only similarity between these musical ideas which are different texturally, gesturally, and above all, tonally. They seem to me to be two separate and autonomous, although melodically similar, events. Essentially, compared to *Event x*, *Event b(x)* has a clear harmonic and tonal definition (in F sharp minor, versus the tonal ambiguity/chromaticism of *Event x*). The tonal–harmonic cohesion of this idea contrasts, however, with the motivic incompleteness in many of its occurrences. This aspect makes *Event b(x)* less regular and predictable, thus triggering the listener’s aptitude, identified by Ricoeur (1986, pp. 102–103), ‘to follow the story’ in the continuation of the movement. So, the first presentation of *Event b(x)*, after just two bars (32–33), is interrupted suddenly by another event, the ‘fliessend’ block trill-motive+*Event y* (marked *sf, pp*), which ‘swallows’ the continuation of *Event b(x)*. This theme is interrupted again in the continuation of the movement. At bar 81, *Event y* in the first violins and violas is superimposed on *Event b(x)*. However, the former does not seem a mere accompaniment; instead, with its agential intrusiveness, it tends to ‘hide’ *Event b(x)*. At bar 87, the trill-motive seems to ‘help’ *Event y* to prevail over *Event b(x)* at bars 88–90, where *Event y* is the only uncontested idea. Analogous heterophonic superimpositions of *Event y* happen at the occurrences of *Event b(x)* at bar 96, and in the development at bar 116. Then *Event b(x)* is almost made unrecognisable by the superimposition of *Event y* at bar 135 (Ex. 3.12, II, 33). In the recapitulation from bars 153 to 162, *Event b(x)* is presented with *Event y*, which seems to accompany the former (Ex. 3.13, II, 34, in the square). Finally, it is only at the coda in bars 217–227 that *Event b(x)* (Ex. 3.14, II, 35, in the square) acquires definite thematic completeness and fluency, in a 10-bar uninterrupted melody.

The climax, *Event c* (bars 194–212, Ex. 3.5, II, 24–25), is presented only once, unlike *Event x*, *Event y*, *Event a* and *Event b(x)*. However, its morpho-syntactic autonomy and

individualisation are strong. In fact, this section's morphology is determined mainly by its gesture—an Adornian *Durchbruch*—in the force of its sound. *Event c1* (bars 194–198) and *Event c2* (bars 203–212) present an amorphous, highly distinctive and inarticulate sound mass, although the former manifests some elements of chorale-like regularity.<sup>53</sup> Another highly distinctive and disruptive element is the most debated and most dissonant chord in Mahler's music, in *Event c2*. According to Agawu (1986, p. 232), this chord comprises a bi-triadic dominant complex (a triad of F sharp and B flat). I would define it as a 'simulacrum of tonality', given that it results from the addition of thirds beneath the note A (bar 203 onwards) to determine a nine-note chord.

Having identified the musical features which make these ideas highly morpho-syntactically individualised, I can now turn my attention in the rest of this section to the semantic dimension of Micznik's 'story' level. In this view, these autonomous basic musical ideas are articulated so as to be assimilable to narrative events through easily identifiable 'intertextual connotations'. Micznik (2001, p. 211) uses this phrase to define musical meanings arising from references to other musical texts according to shared conventions by a connotative system of signification. These 'intertextual connotations' play an essential role in the model of music signification I consider. In particular, according to Micznik (2001, p. 211), 'music, even when it relies on referential meanings, remains basically a self-referential system, in which the majority of connotations are shared intertextually'. At this stage of my analytical apparatus, then, my task is to identify these 'intertextual connotations' that seem, only in the movement, to be an important semantic resource. In doing this, an essential help

---

<sup>53</sup> I use the same letter *c* for both sections, finding its justification in this sound band gesture that both *Event c1* and *Event c2* present and not for the primary parameters' affinities, which are absent between these two events.

to my textual analysis comes from previous interpretative readings in the Mahlerian literature.

*Event x* seems to refer in its tonal ambiguity/chromaticism to the music of composers whose music had often been more complex, chromatically speaking, than Mahler's usual style. Rothkamm (2003, p. 102) detects a reference to Liszt's *Trauergondel* No. 2, and Constantin Floros (1985, p. 298) notes the mood of the prelude from the third act of Wagner's *Tristan und Isolde*. This tonal ambiguity/chromaticism, rarely found in Mahler's music, seems foreign to the enlarged diatonicism of the other events. For this reason, *Event x* seems to fall into the category of stylistic borrowings rather than musical quotations, which in Mahler's music are usually integrated into his idiom. If we consider this stylistic borrowing in the light of those ideas of Samuels I borrowed in Chapter One, p. 7, then *Event x* poses a narrative 'present time', signalled by the adoption of a more tonally ambiguous and chromatic music to signify the contemporary present. This contrasts with the more diatonic style prevalent in other musical ideas in the movement (and generally elsewhere in Mahler).

The acute reading by Johnson (2009, p. 29), however, seems to locate this strange musical idea in a more convincing semantic field. Johnson interprets this introduction-refrain as a 'human voice' because of its aperiodic and improvisatory character. Moreover, 'this is certainly a voice, but one that quickly gets lost and apparently is unable to frame a statement or construct an identity' (Johnson, 2009, p. 29).

At the same time, this idea leads back to another intertextual code related to the above-mentioned meta-referential function of the slow introduction of classical symphonies. In this search for a lost identity, *Event x* during the movement leads most often to a more genuinely Mahlerian but highly contrasting *Event a*. The morpho-syntactic slippage between the two ideas corresponds to a clear semantic gap between them. Numerous readings of *Event a*



seem to agree about ascribing to it a sort of ‘nostalgic telling’. So Rothkamm (2003, pp. 103–104) detects in the theme a reference to the *Zunftmotiv* of Wagner's *Meistersinger von Nürnberg*. Bergquist connects this theme to the large opening interval in the Adagio of Bruckner's Ninth (1980, pp. 340–341).

Adorno claims that the juxtaposition of major and minor tones in Mahler's music comes from ‘a primeval world in which antithetical principles have not yet hardened to logical opposites’ (Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 23). So, it is not surprising that *Event b(x)* contrasts semantically less with *Event a*, thanks to the textural and tonal similarities between these two events, than with *Event x*, which *Event b(x)* more strictly resembles, motivically. According to narratologist Gerald Prince (1992, p. 146), one of the markers of a high degree of narrativity in a text is the presence of structural conflict. Here, this feature is detectable in the discrepancy between motivic difference and semantic affinity between the two themes—*Event a* and *Event b(x)*. Thus, whereas in the Ninth ‘each theme projects its own, well-defined semantic features’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 213), in this movement there is, surprisingly, less semantic variety in the first presentation of the themes. To return to Adorno's temporal dimension of the ‘primeval world’, the lack of semantic opposition between the two themes suggests that they represent the same (undetermined) past time, which differs from the ‘present time’ of *Event x*.

Agawu (1986, p. 228) finds that ‘every subsequent occurrence of [*Event x*, *Event a*, or *Event b(x)*] produces a sense of reminiscence that is not merely the recall of previously stated material but, in the single-mindedness of the thematic process, a reference to something older, something more archaic’. However, considering again the intertextual view of Samuels (1995, pp. 141–142), I see this intrinsic ‘sense of reminiscence’ as present only in the first and second theme, not in *Event x*. This event, rather, seems to be the starting point of a ‘flashback’ to ‘something older’, focused by two themes, because of its being a

borrowing of a tonally ambiguous and chromatic musical style, compared to the diatonicism of *Event b(x)*.

Its connective nature determines the semantics of *Event y*. De La Grange (2007/2011, p. 439) defines this idea as ‘almost mechanical’. He hears it as an Adornian *Weltlauf* (‘course of time’), ‘the indifference and the banality of the everyday life’ (de La Grange, 2008, p. 1500). By developing this suggestion, I add in more imaginative language the claim that this idea here represents a sort of ‘wheel of time’. This interpretation is suggested by the melodic profile’s clear musical iconicity and by its functioning as a musical idea which makes the time of the musical ‘discourse’ of the other ideas ‘stream’.

The climax (*Event c*, Ex. 3.5, II, 24–25) is preceded by *Event x* (bars 184–193, Ex. 3.6, II, 26) that also here seems to have a function of introducing something older,<sup>54</sup> but not the nostalgic *Event a* introduced by the same idea (*Event x*) at the beginning of the movement. Mahler accentuates the uncertain character of *Event x* (‘etwas zögernd’, ‘slightly hesitant’) as if in a stronger effort to remember something terrible expressed by the force of the sound (*fff*, bar 194, a full-orchestra chord) of *Event c*. This musical idea has not previously been heard in the Symphony and is characterised by a painful gesture with quasi-religious connotations. These are inferable from the presence in *Event c1* of a chorale, featuring a surrogate organ pedal and a quasi-modal harmony. Support for this interpretation comes from David Matthews (1996, pp. 400–402), who notes that the terrifying nine-note chord in the section I have called ‘*Event c1*’ (bar 203) contains all the notes of bars 113–115 of the third movement, ‘Purgatorio’—a passage in which Mahler’s marginal inscription quotes Matthew 6:10, ‘Dein Wille geschehe!’ (‘Your will be done’).<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> The harmonic likeness mentioned here, identified by Rothkamm (2003, p. 106), between ideas *Event c1* and *Event a*, supports my interpretation of *Event c1* as a retrospective gesture.

<sup>55</sup> According to Rothkamm (2003, p. 107), this chord expresses a fatalistic pathos because of Mahler’s marital crisis.

According to this religious reading, the episode seems to describe a pathway from universal piety to a catastrophic personal pain. The latter seems an epigonic expression of Romantic autobiography in notes. Also in this movement—as in the first movement of the Ninth, according to Micznik’s analysis (2001)—the morpho-syntactic changes in these ideas during the movement correspond to semantic evolutions. In other words, only *Event x* in its occurrences seems semantically stable in its shapelessness; the other events change their semantics during the movement. In spite of the more subjectively connoted readings of *Event x* by de La Grange (2011, p. 439), Rothkamm (2003, p. 101) and Floros (1985, p. 298), I hear in it a more ‘objective’ colour of a narrating voice searching a stream of a memory of the ‘story’ the two themes are trying to tell. This reading is suggested by the ‘neutral’ gesture of this musical idea, in its tendency to isochrony and its lack of semantic change during the movement.

Instead, the variable geometry of *Event a* and *Event b(x)* and their play of omissions and displacement connote their strong semantic evolutions. In fact, the first occurrence (bars 16–27) of *Event a* presents its ‘nostalgic recollection’. But in the second presentation (bars 49–80) of this idea is a greater completeness of that recollection, without the disturbing *Event y* of the previous occurrence. This does not happen without difficulties in ‘remembering’, as revealed by Coburn’s cell 4 (Ex. 3.10, II, 31), which iconically seems what I could define as a ‘stuttering memory’ to mean the experience of trying to remember something which you cannot quite recall in full, but only in fragments, as suggested at bars 56–57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 67, 75, 77, 78. The two short occurrences of *Event a* in the development (bars 122–123 and 126–127) can be seen, given their brevity, as ‘short reminiscences’ of previous recollections. These occurrences, being short, are ‘treated’ by a ubiquitous *Event y*. At bars 122–123 and 126–127, for example, *Event a* is preceded by a ‘demoniac’ solo violin playing a motive from *Event y*. In the other occurrences, this semantic content of *Event a*’s ‘short

reminiscences' remains the same. At the end of the movement, however, its morphology suggests a 'fragmentary' recollection (in the occurrences at bars 253–257 and 260–275).

*Event b(x)* follows a semantic pathway of a slow unfolding of its thematic continuity. Disrupted in most occurrences (bars 81, 116, 135) by *Event y*, it finally frees itself from the yoke of this event in the occurrences at bars 153–158 and 162–173. With their chromaticism, however, some groups of four semiquavers here kaleidoscopically 'distort' the recollection. Finally, at bar 217, the theme acquires its completeness. Its recollection thus becomes fluent, and some motives of *Event y* assume the role of a more homophonic and submissive counter-melody.

*Event y* is the idea most susceptible to change semantically during the movement. In the beginning, its tone is quite 'neutral' and 'objective', expressing 'a stream of time'. In the next occurrences the dynamic contrasts increase, and from bar 87, due to a 'sharp' orchestration, the tone of the '*Weltlauf*' becomes sardonic. This aspect is evident in the solo violin at bar 120, a gesture in Mahler's music often associated with a demoniac sarcasm (as in the Fourth's second movement), and then at bars 137–140 the music assumes a 'colossal character'. Given its ubiquity, the most significant evolution of this idea is conveyed by its near-absence in the coda; this will have significant discursive implications.

To sum up, the discussion of this section demonstrates that the basic musical ideas are morpho-syntactically and semantically highly autonomous and individualised, and can thus be assimilable to narrative events. In the next section, on Micznik's 'discourse' level, I will try to understand if the unfolding of these events in the 'discourse' generates other layers of meaning.

## 2. The Analysis of the ‘Discourse’ Level <sup>56</sup>

The dimension of ‘discourse’ in its theoretic-analytic dimensions—narrative functions, gestural connotations, temporal discursive processes—implies a comparison of the actual discursive unfolding of the movement with ideal structural models. These are predetermined by a) the conventionalised form to which the movement might be ascribable, and b) the discursive and temporal parameters established at its beginning. Point b) is easily identifiable through careful analysis of the sequence of events of the beginning of the movement. A more difficult task is point a), given the very different positions in the literature on this topic.

Explaining the movement’s form on the grounds of purely musical formal models, Bergquist (1980, pp. 353–354) recalls the paradigm of the double variation, applied earlier by Erwin Ratz (1955) to Mahler’s Ninth Symphony. Agawu’s (1986, p. 227) explanation of the movement’s form uses the literary paradigm of statement–elaboration–restatement–climax–closure, taken from literary theorist Barbara Herrnstein-Smith (1968). Coburn (2002, p. 122) observes that the sonata form paradigm works reasonably well, except for the absence of pre-Wagnerian conventional tonal areas, according to the traditional tonal plot of sonata form. Although I consider these aspects of the movement, I regard the movement’s form in its ‘diachronic’ dimension as a dynamic teleological process across the compositional process. My aim is not to label the form of the last draft of the compositional process, but rather to understand how Mahler arrived there from the earliest draft. From this viewpoint, this process has a starting point—the traditional sonata form to which many scholars refer—and an arrival point at the last stage of the compositional process. At the end of this pathway of narrativisation of the earliest formal schemata, in any case, sonata form

---

<sup>56</sup> I have published a part of this section in Pinto, 2017, pp. 21–22.

remnants are clearly identifiable—for example, the exposition, development and recapitulation that are basically recognisable in the movement.

To come back to my approach, then, it seems appropriate, considering the above discussion, to search for the narrative unfolding of the movement. That is, to analyse it in terms of the difference of its ‘discourse’ from the traditional sonata’s teleological tonal and temporal ploy that Mahler probably had in mind when starting the composition of the movement.

In the last compositional stage (OD) of the Tenth’s first movement, the sonata form’s basic conventional scheme is modified in two ways. First, the pair *Event a–Event b(x)* acts as a free strophic variation pattern, occurring thirteen times in the movement<sup>57</sup> (Table 3.1, II, 37–39).<sup>58</sup> Second, *Event x*, *Event y* or the climax section (*Event c*) are inserted before, after or between each occurrence of the two-theme pair of this recurring pattern. Neither of the two themes (*Event a* and *Event b(x)*) maintains the same key for the entire movement. In their returns, their tonal and gestural definitions ‘bring relaxation and stability’ to use a phrase employed by Micznik (2001, p. 225) concerning the two themes of the Ninth’s first movement. Because of these features, then, the two themes are assimilable to Barthes’s (1966/1977, pp. 92–97) ‘nuclei’. Micznik (2001, p. 24) connects a gestural and tonal stability of the two main themes of the Ninth’s first movement with a ‘pastness of events recounted’ by oral narrative, ‘hence supplying the distancing and objectification characteristic of narrative genres’. The same thing happens with the two themes of this movement, but they manifest a stronger nature of ‘recounting’ in their variable and

---

<sup>57</sup> During the movement, in some ‘strophes’ is present only one of the two themes.

<sup>58</sup> Tables 3.1 (II, 37–39), 4.1 (II, 77–79), 5.3 (II, 113–115), 6.2 (II, 130–135), 7.1 (II, 176–178), labeled ‘overall multi-levelled formal view’ present several different levels of formal analysis of the entire movement. These collate previous attempts to describe the form of the movement, and also my own view of its formal structure. In what follows, I shall refer to the divisions laid out in this table.

intermittent discursive continuity, just by the ‘stuttering memory’ of cell 4, mentioned earlier (p. 86). With these features, therefore, Mahler seems to testify to the difficulty of recollecting his ideas in Genette’s meta-referential level of ‘narration’ (for more depth on this, see section 7 in this chapter).

Given its morphological uncertainty (a ‘*zögernd*’ gesture), *Event x* seems to assume in the movement the role of Micznik’s ‘static section’, an atemporal suspension of action. On deeper examination, however, the narrative function of this idea appears more complex. Applying Almén’s view (see p. 16) to this event, its morphological difference from the other basic music ideas—and above all its recurrence during the movement—make me suspect it to have an ‘actorial’ discursive role. To be more precise, *Event x* seems to have an actantial<sup>59</sup> function as a motivic generator of the two themes, given that it contains the motivic materials with which the other events are built. As in the piano accompaniment in Schubert’s *Erlkönig*, according to Cone’s analysis (1974, pp. 1–19), in occurrence after occurrence this idea works as a ‘plan of instruction’ of motivic material of the other events. In this way, the idea seems to represent the voice of the composer or narrator, who creates other musical ideas from the shapeless motivic material of *Event x*. But this creative act seems to happen in a recent time (because of its tonal ambiguity/chromaticism), compared with that of the two themes (characterised instead by an enlarged diatonicism). This, however, is a hypothesis that needs to be supported by an analysis of the work’s compositional process to understand if and to what extent this is a trace of a diachronic narrative impulse of the composer. In any case, at this stage of my analysis I can establish that *Event x*, with its iterative occurrences during the movement, works as a connective element to lead the musical discourse to other ideas, and thus is a Barthesian ‘catalyser’.

---

<sup>59</sup> See p. 16 for the meaning of this term.

The efforts of *Event x*'s 'etwas zögernd' attempts to recall the two themes or *Event c* (which follow it during the movement) suggest that this time is different from when these happenings (two themes and *Event c*—nuclei) are recounted. The 'streaming' character of *Event y* gives it a role comparable to the narrative's 'catalyser'. In Barthes's terms (1977, pp. 93–97), this discursive function 'accelerate[s], delay[s], give[s] fresh impetus to the discourse', temporally connecting the recounted happenings (the *Event a/b(x)* pair of themes). This event also has an actorial status, in Almén's terms (see p. 16), given its morphological and anthropomorphic evolution and its reoccurrence during the movement. The two events of climax (*Event c1* and *Event c2*) can then be described as 'nuclei', given the more defined gesturality that makes them hinges for the entire passage, and probably for the whole movement.

Amongst the many gestural connotations of the movement, two cases deserve particular attention. One is the gestural contrast between the two themes. Here, as in the Ninth's first movement, there is a modal change between them—from F sharp major to F sharp minor, in the Tenth—instead of a conventional modulation to the dominant from its tonic major key. Unlike that movement of the Ninth Symphony, however, here there is no significant gestural contrast between the two themes, *Event a* and *Event b(x)*, and the sonata form's morphologic contrast between the two themes is absent. In light of this, it is worth considering the first occurrence of the two themes: at bars 32–34 (Ex. 3.3. II, 22), the thirds and sixths of the melody in the second theme—*Event b(x)*—seem to refer to the same intervals of the first theme—*Event a*—at bars 16–17 (Ex. 3.2, II, 21). In this way, the second theme seems a continuation of the 'discourse' of the first theme, after the interruption by *Event y* at bars 27–31. In the same passage, the modal change from major to minor is mediated by a common dominant chord (as per conventional rules). However, this is postponed until the first bar of the new theme, after the tonal deadlock of bars 30–31, where



F and E are natural instead of sharp. This harmonic pathway suggests that *Event b(x)* is located at a different temporal narrative level to *Event y* and the same as *Event a*.

A more readable gestural connotation is evident between *Event x* (bars 183–193) and *Event c* (bars 194–212, Ex. 3.5, II, 24–25). In this passage the weakness of tonality in *Event x* and *Event c2*, as well as the fact that the climax does not belong to a tonally predetermined sonata-form area, cancel out any conventionalised micro-formal tonal goal-orientated plots. Thus, a ‘gestural connotation’ is given in this passage through the strong gestural emphasis (thanks to secondary parameters) of *Event x*, on the one hand, and the climax (*Event c1*, *Event y*, *Event c2*), on the other. Their strong intertextual connotation replaces the formally predetermined tonal conflict (or differentiation), especially between *Event x* and the climax (*Event c1*, *Event y*, *Event c2*, Ex. 3.5, II, 24–25), along with (albeit to a lesser extent) between *Event c1/Event c2* and *Event y*.

In Genette’s theory of narrative (1972/1980, pp. 33–160), four temporal discursive dimensions of narrative events—duration, frequency, speed, and order—produce layers of discursive meaning. According to Micznik’s theory (2001, pp. 219–249), these features can be detected in Mahler’s music when the discursive unfolding of the events refers to a narrative plot which is alternative to that established by conventions or by the temporal patterns established at the beginning of the movement.

In this movement, occurrences of the two themes (*Event a* and *Event b(x)*) have variable, irregular durations. More specifically, we may suspect a possible narrative plot of ‘revenge’ of *Event b(x)* on *Event a* (Table 3.1, II, 37–39). So, in the exposition, *Event a* (first theme), overall, is longer than the second theme *Event b(x)*. In the recapitulation, the situation is reversed: the second theme, *Event b(x)*, overall is longer than the first, and lasts more than

*Event a* in strophe VIII (bars 151–158, see Table 3.1, II, 38).<sup>60</sup> In the coda, the duration of *Event a* is longer than that of *Event b(x)*, but the latter lasts longer than the former in strophes IX (bars 162–183) and X (bars. 213–227, Table 3.1, II, 39). The durational strategy during the movement of *Event y* is even more easily legible in terms of the hypothesised plot mentioned earlier. In fact, the duration of this event increases at the end of the exposition, in the development and the recapitulation, in relation to *Event y* ‘obscuring’ *Event a* and *Event b(x)*. *Event y*’s duration, then, decreases in the coda, with its final occurrence at bars 217–227, when *Event b(x)* is ‘emancipated’. Here *Event y* at bars 218–225 is less contrasting with *Event b(x)* and works almost as an accompaniment of the latter.

The meaning—an essential component of the narrative plot—of *Event y* as a ‘delay’ or ‘disturbing of memory’ finds support in a piece of evidence concerning its duration (Table 3.1, II, 37–39). The long-lasting occurrence of *Event a* at bar 49 does not contain the motive *Event y* which was present in the closing part of the previous occurrence (bars 16–26) of the same theme. Like *Event y*, the other catalyser, *Event x*, has a decreasing duration during the movement. Thus, there are 30 bars in the exposition, but a total of 18 bars in the development, recapitulation, climax and coda. After the first occurrence (16 bars), in the following, there are nine bars (in three occurrences) and seven bars (in one occurrence). In other words, the durational balance between *Event a* and *Event b(x)* in the recapitulation happens at the expense of catalysers *Event x* and, especially, of *Event y* which always lasts for less time. These pieces of evidence then, suggest, more specifically, a plot of slow ‘liberation’ of thematic continuity of *Event b(x)*. The framework of this evolving pattern is that of full openness of a memory (nuclei *Event a* and *Event b(x)*) that in the coda cuts any

---

<sup>60</sup> According to Micznik (2001), ‘strophes’ are musical-narrative cyclical units consisting of one or more events (catalysers and nuclei).

ties with other parenthetical diegetic levels that are different to those of the events narrated in the nuclei.

Genette's next dimension, frequency, is a powerful force in creating the narrative of the movement. It is characterised by a high frequency of events, an aspect identified by Micznik (2001) in the Ninth as a marker of a high degree of narrativity. This aspect in the movement is present in three different but coexistent ways. First, the occurrences of *Event y* in bars 27–30 and 33–39 seem the continuation of the two themes (*Event a*, bars 16–31, *Event b(x)*, bars 32–38), but are semantically autonomous from them. Second, is the heterophonic overlapping of *Event y* to *Event b(x)* and *Event a* during the last part of the exposition and the entire development. Third, is the addition to the sonata form's formal scheme of the standalone climactic section, which presents three *Events* (*Event x*, *Event c1/Event c2*, *Event y*), each having its own semantic connotation, in 28 bars (Table 3.1, II, 39). Though not the highest frequency of events in the movement, the high number of events in these few bars, contrasting semantically with the other events of the movement, is nonetheless remarkable.

At a macro-formal level, the variation of frequency of events during the movement is another support to the above-suggested plot of 'revenge', through thematic continuity, of *Event b(x)* on *Event a* and *Event y*. More specifically, the frequency of catalysers (*Event x* and *Event y*) increases in the development and diminishes in the recapitulation and coda in correspondence to the above-mentioned possible plot of cathartic 'liberation of memory', freeing it from previous impediments (Table 3.1, II, 38–39).

In the manuscript, the number of tempo changes in the draft of the last compositional stage is a remarkable marker of the Genettian dimension of speed. As suggested by Colin Matthews (2010, p. 3), Mahler would probably have added tempo indications in this draft. However, many points of gestural contrast could also be regarded as intrinsic changes in speed, even without an explicit tempo indication. For example, *Event y* in its 'streaming'

sequence of semiquavers, contrasts with the longer durations of the two themes — *Event a* and *Event b(x)*.

Aspects assimilable to the Genettian dimension of order of events also contribute to determine the ‘liberation’ of thematic continuity of *Event b(x)*. This pathway is accompanied by some aspects that Micznik considers in the Ninth’s first movement as markers of an avoided plot denouement (Micznik, 2001, p. 238). In this movement these aspects are two harmonic detours and two inversions of the presentation order of the two themes. So, in the exposition (Table 3.1, II, 37), two strophes (I and II) of *Event a–Event b(x)* pair in this sequence in the keys of F sharp major and F sharp minor, respectively. But in strophe III, at bar 96, *Event b(x)* is presented (without its preceding companion *Event a*) in B flat minor, a key proposed at bar 92 by the previous motive *Event y*. In addition to disturbing (overlapping), this motive also tonally ‘infects’ *Event b(x)* so that the occurrence of the latter (bars 96–97) is transient. Strophe III is followed by a further occurrence of *Event y* and *Event x* (Table 3.1, II, 37). At the beginning of the development (strophe IV, bars 116–123, Table 3.1, II, 38), the pair of themes occurs in reversed order: *Event b(x)–Event a*, in the ‘wrong’ keys of A minor and E flat minor, respectively. Then, in bars 126–127, *Event a* is presented without *Event b(x)*, again in a ‘wrong’ key: A minor. An apparent balance is established at bar 133 (strophe VI), when the two themes are presented in the correct order *Event a–Event b(x)*, both in the same key, E flat minor. In the circle of fifths, however, this key is far from the starting keys of F sharp major and F sharp minor.

After a new interlude of *Event y*, the beginning of the recapitulation (strophe VII) presents the two themes in the right order and in the keys of the first presentation. This re-established order, however, is apparent only because *Event b(x)* is again affected by the overlapping *Event y*. Thus, this incomplete balance seems to generate another inversion at bars 162–183 (Table 3.1, II, 38–39), but in this case the two themes assume their initial keys. In the coda,

the right order of the two themes is restored at strophe X, bars 213–227, and this ‘reconciliation’ corresponds to the full discursive continuity of *Event b(x)*, finally freed from the oppression of *Event y*.

After the analysis of narrativity of the last compositional stage, it is now time to turn to the second stage of my apparatus, the analysis of narrativity in the compositional process of each section of the movement. I will do this at Micznik’s ‘story’ and ‘discourse’ levels in order to testify to the diachronic process of narrativisation during the compositional process.

### 3. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 1–111 (Exposition)

During the exposition, we can identify significant clues to narrativisation in the compositional chronology of the basic musical ideas of the movement. In fact, the majority of these ideas change during the compositional process and achieve in this way a gestural differentiation which can be considered a narrative aspect, according to Micznik’s theory (2001).

The function of *Event x* as a ‘motivic source’ and a motivic ‘plan of instruction’ of the other musical ideas—*Event a*, *Event b(x)*, *Event y*—as I suggested earlier, seems confirmed by the analysis of the compositional process. More specifically, a motivic relationship of the two themes with *Event x* is soon established from the earliest pages. However, during the compositional process these two themes are made motivically and gesturally more autonomous from their ‘source’. This aspect is clear if we focus on a process of discarding of motives in the conception of the two themes, *Event a* and *Event b(x)*, across the compositional chronology. Their early versions contain more of Coburn’s cell 2 (Ex. 3.10, II, 30–31), taken from *Event x*, than in the draft of last compositional stage. In particular, for *Event a* (the first theme), Coburn’s descending cell 2, present on I-DSS3, I-DSS5 I-DSS6,

I-SS3 (see the red ovals in Ex. 3.15, II, 42), is discarded later in the compositional process. For the occurrence at bars 32–33 of the second theme—*Event b(x)*—it is true that, according to Colin Matthews (1977, pp. 127–129), in the pre-draft non-teleological sketch pages I-PSK3 and I-PSK4 (Ex. 3.26, II, 61), the earliest precursors of this and other *Event b(x)* occurrences in the movement can be identified. It is also true that Coburn’s cell 4 in I-PSK1 (see the oval in Ex. 3.17, II, 44) is discarded from *Event b(x)*’s melodic profile in the subsequent versions of this idea (Ex. 3.17, II, 44).

More specifically, across the compositional process *Event a* (the first theme) achieves a stronger degree of gestural differentiation from the monological (in Bakhtinian sense, see p. 30) and monophonic identity of *Event x*. In fact, in *Event a* a textural polyphonic enrichment is generally visible in all the compositional chronology of this idea, in contrast to *Event x*’s static nature, evident in its lack of huge changes during the compositional process. The first theme’s (*Event a*) compositional process includes not only refinements but also the swapping of groups of bars among those that in the last compositional stage will be (in order of presentation) the first (bars 16–31), second (bars 49–57) and third (bars 58–80) occurrences of this theme. Another aspect of progressive morphological differentiation of this from other ideas can be identified in this complicated conception. To understand this aspect fully, I present the compositional chronology of the initial 78 bars in Table 3.2, II, 40–41 with sequential cells ordered with numbers ‘1)–8)’.

This chronology can support a clue of gestural narrative differentiation of *Event a* from the monologic, monophonic and shapeless *Event x*. In particular, during the compositional process, *Event a* reaches its distinction from *Event x* gradually, by swapping groups of bars to achieve a thematic fluency and an ordered articulation in more clearly distinguished internal subsections. This swapping is clearly observable in:

- I-DSS5 (Mahler-Bouwman 2, 2017, pp. 1–7, referenced in Table 3.2, II, 40, cell 3)
- in its refinement I-DSS7 (Mahler-Bouwman 2, 2017, pp. 1–4, referenced in Table 3.2, II, 41, cell 5),
- in I-SS2 (Mahler-Bouwman 2, 2017, pp. 2–3,7, referenced in Table 3.2, II, 41, cell 6),
- in I-SS3 (Mahler-Bouwman 2, 2017, pp. 7–9, Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, referenced in Table 3.2 II, 41, cell 7),
- in I-OD2-3, I-OD4-5 (Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, pp. 1–4, 5–9, referenced in Table 3.2, II, 41, cell 8).

At the early stages of the compositional process, then, the occurrences of this theme are less differentiated. If Mahler wants to use it to narrate something, at this stage the ‘telling’ is morphologically less detailed. It is Mahler’s purpose, during the compositional process, to present this musical ‘something’ more fluently and completely. Given this, it is reasonable to think that Bergquist’s (1980, p. 8) harmonic ‘displacements’ within this idea in the OD are only a tip of the iceberg, a remnant of the laborious compositional procedure mentioned earlier, and a trace of this narrativising purpose.

A process of gestural differentiation to a lesser extent than for the two themes *Event a* and *Event b(x)* also happens in the compositional chronology of *Event y*, in particular in the genesis of its second occurrence, at bars 34–38 which come from *Event x*, due to Coburn’s cell 1 (Ex. 3.10, II, 30–31). For this event, this process mainly concerns the secondary parameters. For this purpose noteworthy is the addition of the trill-motive at bar 35 on I-DSS3 (Ex. 3.17, II, 44, square 1). Moreover, the accompaniment and the dynamic and timbral indications in the following versions on I-DSS7 and I-SS2, at bars 36–38 (Ex. 3.17, II, 44, squares 2 and 3), together with the trill motive, differentiate this idea from the inert

solo of *Event x*.

The semantic autonomy of these basic musical ideas, which renders them comparable to narrative events, is conveyed by their gestural evolution across their compositional chronology. Regarding this semantic autonomy, the most significant compositional process evidence for *Event x* is the addition of the dynamic and instrumental indications. Thus, ‘*Violen*’ (‘violas’), on I-DSS7 (Mahler-Bouwman 2, 2017, p. 1), has strong intertextual value by referring to an instrumental topic of the viola’s ‘speaking voice’, traceable to Berlioz’s *Harold en Italie*.<sup>61</sup> The indication ‘*ohne Ausdruck*’ (‘without expression’) on the same page seems to refer to an ‘objective’ neutrality of the ‘way of speaking’ of the viola’s ‘voice’.

To *Event a*, the compositional process confers semantic autonomy by adding a gradual building of ‘nostalgic recollection’—by using a diatonic and more Mahlerian Adagio theme, but also by attempting to ‘focus’ its details. Some motives are added and discarded within a polyphonic (in musical and Bakhtinian terms) texture; others find their focus on their ‘correct’ pitch only at the last compositional stage. The complicated above-mentioned (p. 97) swapping of bars among the occurrences of *Event a* (the first theme) during its compositional process reveals the difficulty in establishing a ‘before’ and ‘after’ that enhance the semantic dimension of a difficult nostalgic recollection.

By contrast, the compositional process adds very little to *Event b(x)*, which even in the earliest sketch page appears as an *Event x* ‘temporalised’ in the same semantic dimension as *Event a*. Later, in contrast with the ‘*ohne Ausdruck*’ (‘without expression’) uncertain gesture of *Event x*, *Event b(x)* becomes ‘*etwas fliessender*’ (‘a bit more fluent’, in I-DSS7, Ex. 3.17, square 2, II, 44). Concerning *Event y*, the additions during the compositional process (Ex.

---

<sup>61</sup> About the viola’s speaking voice in this work by Berlioz, see Cone (1974, p. 92).



3.17, II, 44) seem to enhance its ‘motoric’ expression, its ‘neutrality’, in an objective *Weltlauf* dimension of ‘things which happen’ without the control of the subject who recalls and narrates in the present.

The study of the compositional process allows identification of a process of narrativisation for some of Micznik’s dimensions of ‘discourse’. In other words, the significant feature of Mahler’s process of creating his initial ideas during the compositional process is that they acquire ‘narrative functions’ and narrative temporal organisation of frequency, speed and order of events. In fact, from its earliest page, *Event x* shows its tonal uncertainty, making it comparable to a narrative function of a catalyser that will remain in the last compositional draft. But the most significant discursive evidence of this idea during the compositional process is that on I-DSS3 and I-DSS4 *Event x* is absent; it is present only later in the compositional process, so it was not included in the earliest teleological order planned by Mahler. In this way, it is evident that Mahler wanted to ‘narrativise’ the initial 80 bars (included in those pages) by adding an idea—*Event x*—which has a narrative function that differs from that of the two themes. At the earliest stage of these two pages, then, the movement begins *in medias res* with two nuclei, *Event a* and *Event b(x)*, without introductory preamble or prologue, in a more traditional pattern of bi-thematic sonata-form exposition.

The complication of the construction of *Event a* (first theme), to establish a ‘before’ and ‘after’ and a ‘focusing’ of the telling, supports its reading as nucleus as ‘past recollected’. The second theme *Event b(x)* also seems a nucleus for its tonal definition, but its presence in the OD is transient and so a little less comparable to the stability of this narrative function. The nature of *Event y* as a catalyser is instead soon established in its ‘fliessend’ (‘fluent’) character that is very different from the other catalyser, the inert *Event x*, but has a similar narrative function comparable to a narrative (extradiegetic) framework of the latter.

In terms of the gestural connotations, the keys of the two themes are defined in the earliest pages II-DSS3 and I-DSS4 and then retained in the following pages, so there are no significant changes during the compositional process. At this earliest stage, however, the dialectics of the two themes are not inscribed in the tonal plot convention nor in a strong gestural contrast, but in a slight semantic difference induced by the modal change.

The addition of *Event x* on I-DSS5, I-DSS6 and I-DSS7 determines an increasing frequency of events within the exposition. The tempo indications added on I-DSS7 and in the chronologically subsequent pages make explicit verbally the implicit tempo changes determined on the pages written earlier by the different gestural physiognomies of *Event x* and *Event a*. Two tempo indications added during the compositional process are significant. ‘Andante’ makes the ‘neutral’ proceeding (neither slow nor fast) of the isochrony explicit, and ‘Adagio’, the slowness of the (difficult) recollection. For the dimension of the order of events across versions, there are no inversions of events but a paraleptical<sup>62</sup> pathway of the addition of *Event x* during the compositional process. In this way Mahler creates a ‘second dimension’ of narrative temporality, given *Event x*’s gesturality, semantics and narrative function, which differ profoundly to that of the two themes.

#### 4. The Process of Narrativisation in bars 112–140 (Development) and 141–182 (Recapitulation)

From the point of view of morphology, it is remarkable that both the development and the recapitulation are characterised by a compositional process of ‘additive layers’. Thus, the earliest pages generally present only a melody (and possibly a skeletal homophonic accompaniment). Only on pages written later are these basic patterns enriched

---

<sup>62</sup> For the definition of the Genettian term ‘paralepsis’, see Chapter One, section 1, p. 11.

polyphonically—in layers of counter-melodies and motives taken from the event to which the same early schematic ideas belong or from other events. From one viewpoint, the development of a skeletal scheme of early sketches in a more complex pattern seems a compositional trait of many composers and so cannot be a clue to a peculiar narrative strategy. From another point of view, though, it is also true that in the specific case of the development of this movement, this procedure seems a narrative way of acquiring autonomy of musical ideas through this textural–gestural enrichment in polyphonic layers. In this way, these musical ideas become comparable progressively to the referentiality of the events of verbal narrative, although without their referential–denotative precision.

In the majority of cases it is *Event y* that is added in layers to the occurrences of *Event a* (first theme, bars 122–123) or second theme *Event b(x)* (bars 81–86, 96–97, 116–117) in the later sketches and drafts. Notable, for example, in the development are the semiquaver- and trill-motives. On page after page—I-DSS10, I-DSS11, I-SS6—these motives pervade the two sections, overlapping and so ‘undermining’ the short occurrences of the two themes. In this way, then, *Event y*, which in its first presentation (bars 17–31) is a part of *Event a*, becomes autonomous and a ‘protagonist’, an ‘antagonist’ of *Event a* and *Event b*, to be more precise. Moreover, this idea acquires the status of an ‘anthropomorphised’ and oppositional subject—an ‘agent’, in Almén’s terms (see p. 16).

Moreover, in the genesis of the recapitulation are additive layers with *Event y*’s motives—which, again, are added in the chronologically subsequent pages to *Event a*, at bars 178–183 and to *Event b(x)*, at bars 147–150 and 153–158. Then, in the conception of *Event y*’s occurrence at bars 162–173, the annotation ‘polyphon’ on I-SS6 denotes Mahler’s intention (not then implemented) of elaborating these parts in polyphonic layers.

Significantly, in the development, *Event y*’s occurrence at bars 137–140 (see the chronological sequence of pages in Ex. 3.18, II, 45–46) is conceived homophonically rather

than in layers of melodies (Ex. 3.18, II, 45–46 in the square). This different conception may be a marker of Mahler's need, from its conception, to differentiate *Event y*'s morphology, both from that of the other occurrences of *Event y* and from those of *Event a* and *Event b(x)*. In the SS and the OD (Ex. 3.18, II, 45–46), this section was enriched polyphonically by adding semiquaver motives and so made more similar to other occurrences of *Event a* and *Event b(x)*. However, the trombone chords in the OD of these bars are the remnants of the homophonic genesis of this occurrence.

Concerning semantics, as in other parts of the Symphony, during the compositional process there is a progressive gesturalisation of the initial ideas so they acquire that semantic autonomy which makes them definitely comparable to narrative events. This happens in later stages by adding indications of dynamics or, less obviously, by enriching texturally the ideas conceived in the earliest pages. Thus, from one perspective, the homophonically conceived motive *Event y*, bars 137–140 (Ex. 3.18, II, 45–46), is the most differentiated of the occurrences of this event, because of dynamics: at bar 137 *f* on I-SS5 and I-SS6 and *ff* in the OD. As a result, there is a gestural thickening with trombone chords that highlight its 'colossal' character in the OD. From another perspective, though, in the development the progressive adding of polyphonic layers with *Event y* motives enhances the pervasive, incessantly kinetic character as the 'wheel of time'.

*Event b(x)*'s occurrence at bars 153–158 (Mahler-Bouwman 2, 2017, p. 21), presented early on I-DSS14, acquires a semantic characterisation through polyphonic layers during the compositional process. This idea becomes 'distorted' by a chromatic countermelody developed from *Event y*'s semiquaver motive and added on I-SS6, making this occurrence also more 'fliessend'.

At Micznik's 'discourse' level the two sections (development and recapitulation) present clues to the discursive narrative strategy concerning the parameters of narrative functions,

duration and speed, and to an overall construction of a narrative plot. Concerning the narrative functions, in the genesis of the occurrences of *Event y* (bars 112–114, 118–121, 124–125, 128–132, 137–140, 159–161, 174–177 see Table 3.1, II, 37–39) the addition of layers of melody during the compositional process enhance the character of catalysers of this idea. These occurrences lead astray and *displace* the ‘discourse’ by contrasting the uncertain and short ‘narrating’ of the two nuclei, *Event a* and *Event b(x)*. These come to prominence in ever longer occurrences throughout the development and the recapitulation. The genesis of *Event y*’s occurrence of bars 137–140 on I-DSS10 (Ex. 3.18, II, 45–46) is a significant example of a morphological differentiation evidently determined by Mahler’s purpose to confer to these bars a narrative function. After the nucleus—*Event b(x)*, bars 135–136—at the moment of conceiving this earliest version of these bars, Mahler defined the change of syntactic function through a sudden change of writing. So, instead of the polyphony of the other development occurrences of *Event y*, *Event a* and *Event b(x)*, there is a homophonic style in these bars at this moment of the compositional process. Only at a later stage (I-SS6) do these bars become more similar to *Event y* and more polyphonic, although the section keeps its characteristic chords, emphasised by the use of trombones in the OD.

The thematic definitions of *Event a* and *Event b(x)* confer on them the character of *nuclei*; however, Mahler’s overlapping them with ‘objective’ motives of *Event y* indicates his purpose in musically representing something similar to Freudian displacement and suppression of traumatic memory. In the conception of the occurrence of *Event b(x)* at bars 147–150 (Ex. 3.18, II, 47), the emphatic addition of ‘stuttering memory’ cells (Coburn’s cell 4, in bars 147–149, square 2 in Ex. 3.18, II, 47) on I-DSS14 plays a significant role in the movement’s narrative. With this cell Mahler seems to attempt to make the listener aware that such an occurrence is taken with difficulty from an imaginary or actual musical memory.

In fact, in the earliest conception of this occurrence (Ex. 3.18, II, 47, square 1) on I-DSS13, *Event b(x)* is almost absent (or in any case only just recognisable). This motive seems to be ‘recovered’ from memory only on the chronologically later page on I-DSS14, just because these ‘stutters of memory’ are added.

It is evident that the numerous additions of *Event y* during the compositional process, then, prolong the duration of this event within the narrative discourse of the recapitulation. The root of these additions is actantial (according to Almén’s definition). The idea is made the bearer of ‘actoriality’ and participates in a narrative trajectory and in the movement’s diachronic, teleological evolution (this process of displaced memory). Concerning the dimension of the speed of the events, it is clear that the adding this *Event y* motive makes the ‘discourse’ more streamlined and quicker in its presentation, given that the number of events increases during the compositional process.

## 5. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 184–212 (Climax)<sup>63</sup>

The narrative strategy of the much-debated passage of climax relies mainly on a process of inserting new musical ideas during the composition process. In this way, both the degree of narrativity and the Bakhtinian polyphony of text increase. Intertextual connotations play an essential role in the semantic autonomy of the inserted musical ideas.

To provide textual evidence in support of this assertion, I have identified six of this passage’s versions, conceived during the compositional process. I have indicated them in the ‘version number’ rows 1–6 in Table 3.3, II, 56, according to the chronology of the passage.

---

<sup>63</sup> In this section I have also considered the occurrence of *Event x*, bars 184–193, ‘genetically’ strictly connected with the climax, although this musical idea properly belongs to the recapitulation, according to my analysis (Table 3.1, II, 37–39). I have published a slightly different version of this section in Pinto, 2017, pp. 22–33.

In this table, the ‘Discourse position’ columns, numbers 1–4, indicate the units of the syntagmatic sequence of each version. This tabular representation allows easy detection of the additive genesis of the passage. In fact, after the earliest conception of the passage (version 1), where the entire climax is absent, each subsequent version results from each consecutive insertion and replacement of the ideas I call *Event x'*, *Event x''/1*, *Event x''/2*, *Event y* and *Event c2*. Given that the early versions (nos. 1, 2, 3, 4) lack the climactic episode (*Event c1+Event y+Event c2*), some of the ‘Discourse positions’ are empty. In other words, in this table I apply Micznik’s approach by comparing the narrativity of all the versions according to two dimensions. So, in rows 1–6, I compare units within each version and in the columns I compare units of different versions within the same Discourse position.

*Event x* in the column ‘Discourse position 1’ changes very little during the compositional process, so there are no significant changes in narrativity across versions. In the column ‘Discourse position 2’, on the other hand, there are units which are ascribable to different events: *Event x* (*Event x'* in version 2, and *Event x''/1* in version 3), *Event y* (in version 4), *Event c1* (in versions 5 and 6). Hence, at a morphological level across these versions is a process of reduction of irregularity, non-symmetry and non-rhythmicisation, which paradigmatically could be traced back to the introduction–refrain in its many returns in the movement. In addition, the secondary parameters in these versions play a leading role in defining the morphology of *Event x'*, *Event x''/1*, *Event y*, and *Event c1*. In particular, *Event x'* presents, for the first time, the majestic ‘*Orgelklang*’<sup>64</sup> (‘organ sound’) chorale-like gesture. This idea, from *Event x*, is further developed in *Event x''* which was later removed because of its melodic and harmonic and textural likeness to *Event x'*. Unlike *Event x'*, however, *Event x''/1* is gesturally more defined by dynamics, and later, to emphasise the

---

<sup>64</sup> I wish to thank Jörg Rothkamm for suggesting to me this deciphering of a not easily legible annotation in the manuscript.

gesturality of this passage, Mahler uses '*f*' in *Event c1* of version 5 and '*fff*' in *Event c1* of version 6.

With *Event c1* in version 5, the melodic profile of *Event x* and the traces it has left in *Event x'* and *Event x''* are wiped away—although Mahler maintains the '*Orgelklang*' and chorale-like gesture from the previous *Event x'* of DSS and *Event x''*. Moreover, there is here a sonorous depth which contrasts with *Event x*, and the pedal stabilises and consolidates this new 'world'. So, if *Event x'* and *Event x''/1* were 'floating' (as defined by Colin Matthews 1977, p. 135) like *Event x*, *Event c1* in the SS and the OD is not. The dynamics enhance this openness: '*f*' of *Event c1* version 5 versus '*ppp*' of *Event x*'. An important aspect of this entire sequence across versions, however, is that there is a strong dissociation between primary and secondary parameters. So, *Event x'/Event x''/1* and *Event c1* are very different in melody and harmony but very similar in gesture and texture. This aspect has remarkable syntactic and semantic implications. In fact, in all the sections of this Discourse position, at a syntactical level (although these sketches are difficult to decipher) I can notice a progressive process of a sort of 'modalisation' in *Event c1* in the SS and in the OD (see details in Table 3.4, II, 57). The final result of this process is that in the OD the mode of *Event c1* is not just minor but a sort of hypophrygian mode (starting from the note B flat), with the addition of the pitches, D natural, F natural and G natural.

Given this morpho-syntactic evolution of the passage, at a semantic level we can notice a progressive increase in discrete semantic areas during the compositional process. In versions 1, 2 and 3, Discourse positions 1, 2, and 3, there is only one semantic area referring to a tonally ambiguous/chromatic style: *Event x*, and the 'floating' *Event x'*, *Event x''/1* and *Event x''/2*. In versions 4, Discourse positions 1, 2, and 3, there are three areas that are ascribable, respectively to the tonally ambiguous/chromatic style (*Event x*), to 'wheel of time' (*Event y*) and again to the tonally ambiguous/chromatic style (*Event x''*). In versions 5



and 6, Discourse positions 1, 2, 3 and 4, there are four semantic areas, ascribable to the tonally ambiguous/chromatic style (*Event x*), to the topic of ‘chorale-modal music’ (suggested by the above modalisation in *Event c1*), to the semantic contents I have labelled ‘wheel of time’ (*Event y*) and to ‘catastrophe’ (*Event c2*), respectively. Moreover, from versions 4 to 5 there is a reduction of the events ascribable to the tonally ambiguous/chromatic style. This happens because of the gradual replacement, in ‘Discourse position 2’, of *Event x'* and *Event x''/1* by *Event c1* (via the postponing of *Event y* in version 5). Other than being gradual, the passage from *Event x'–Event x''/1* to *Event c1*, in the column ‘Discourse position 2’, does not occur to the same extent for all parameters. In fact, semantically, if the primary parameters ascribe the ideas *Event x'* and *Event x''/1* to *Event x*, the secondary parameters (through the *Orgelklang* gesture) instead make them more similar to *Event c1*. Moreover, the above-mentioned ‘modalisation’ across the versions *Event x'*, *Event x''* and *Event c1* seems to reinforce the intertextual connotation of the *Orgelklang*.

At a ‘discourse’ level, here the ‘discursive’ narrative of the compositional process—the narrative made up by this progressive addition of events—is particularly intense. In other words, the compositional process through which this climax section evolves progressively adds more and more events to it. As a result, there are detectable markers of narrativisation in the majority of dimensions of the ‘discourse’ analytic level: narrative functions, gestural connotations, and temporal discursive processes (frequency and order) of events.

With regard to the dimension of narrative functions, motive *Event x* maintains its narrative function as a catalyser, which in Barthes’s terms *delays* and *leads* the musical ‘discourse’ *astray*, in all the genetic versions. In the early versions 2 and 3, the ‘floating’ ideas *Event x'* and *Event x''* doubtless prolong this function of *Event x*. In this way, these two events can make listeners think of an absence of action or, to be more precise, a waiting for something to happen—which in these versions, however, does not happen. Only in version

4 does Mahler decide to take the step of replacing the first five measures of *Event x''/1* with the streaming idea *Event y* (catalyser) so that the sequence reads: catalyser–catalyser–catalyser. In version 5, Mahler decides to create *Event c* (*Event c1*+*Event c2*), which is a nucleus. In the same version, Mahler puts this *Event c* before *Event y* in the sequence catalyser (*Event x*)–nucleus (*Event c1*)–catalyser (*Event y*)–nucleus (*Event c2*), which will be retained in the OD. From this pathway, it is possible to infer the composer's purpose to reach an 'ideal' narrative discursive fluency given by the alternation of nuclei and catalysers so that the 'discourse' can flow.

A more direct consequence of this additive process across versions is a clear increase in the frequency of events. There is only one event in version 1 (*Event x*), 2 (*Event x* and *Event x'*) and 3 (*Event x* and *Event x''*). In version 4 there are two events (*Event x* and *Event x''/2*, *Event y*) and four events in versions 5 and 6 (*Event x*, *Event c1* and *Event c2*, *Event y*). However, it is evident that the root of this choice is intertextual, not tonal, given the contrast between two different intertextual topics—the chromaticism of *Event x* and the 'chorale–modal music' of *Event c1*. This juxtaposition of different topics can be explained by using Micznik's words (2001, p. 236) about the climactic section (bars 279–308) of the Ninth's first movement. Mahler was aiming to simulate

[...] the more 'concrete' accumulation of events that produces narrative tension in literature, even though here it is more the gestural and connotational semantic content than concrete facts that contribute to this culminating function, which traditionally would have relied more on tonal syntax'. (Micznik 2001, p. 236).

Concerning the speed of the events, the key evidence that can be explained in narrative terms is that in the DSS and the SS of the passage there is no written indication of a change in tempo. To explain the incompleteness of the tempo indication in the OD, Colin Matthews

(2010, p. 3) suggests that Mahler regarded the tempo indications as *Retuschen* ('retouches') to be done after the OD. Alternatively, and more likely, Mahler conceived the tempo indications as written explications of the changes of tempo determined by the different gestures of the events.

Regarding the order of events, in this 'genetic' pathway Mahler's purpose to diverge, during the compositional process, from traditional formal schemata can be detected. He probably regarded such a scheme as an initial memory aid for his 'narrative' writing process. In fact, during the compositional process, Mahler moves away from the order of sonata form to achieve a more idiosyncratic formal organisation given by a sequence of gesturally and intertextually connotated musical ideas. More specifically, in version 1 the only anomaly compared to sonata form is the return of the intro–refrain *Event x* at the end of the recapitulation and its extension (*Event x'*, *Event x''*) in versions 2, 3 and 4. Instead, in versions 5 and 6, the final climax, as an appendix to the sonata form in the OD, is completely defined. In this moving away, however, the most significant elements that disturb the order of sonata form are the highly 'disruptive' *Event c1* and *Event c2*.

## 6. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 213–275 (Coda)

Mahler's intention to increase the morphological aspects of 'diseconomy of materials'<sup>65</sup> and of motivic–thematic fragmentation can be seen in the preparatory materials of the section. At a semantic level, the key narrative aspect is the 'recovery of memory' during the compositional process.

The increasing 'diseconomy of materials', however, does not happen, as in the

---

<sup>65</sup> This phrase is intended as an inversion of Adorno's 'principle of economy' which he attributes to classical sonata form (1960/1992, p. 103).

development and the recapitulation, by adding new motives during the compositional process, but rather by inserting the two occurrences of the second theme *Event b(x)* (bars 217–227 and 258–259). More precisely, bars 217–227 are inserted on I-SS10 but are conceived in the earliest non-teleological sketches I-PSK3 and I-PSK4 (Ex. 3.26, II, 61) and are absent in the DSS pages I-DSS17, I-DSS19 and I-DSS20 (Ex. 3.27, II, 62<sup>66</sup>). Again, on I-SS11 the other occurrence of *Event b(x)* (bars 258–259) is added, which was absent in the previous pages I-DSS17, I-DSS21 and I-SS9 (Ex. 3.25, II, 60 squares 1 and 2). The first of the two *Event b(x)* occurrences, in bars 217–227, is the longest-lasting of this movement. The listener is reminded of the short duration of the previous occurrence of *Event b(x)*. Here, however, Mahler seems to release this event from its function earlier in the movement as an interrupted musical idea by this long-lasting occurrence (12 bars). This is the first time this idea acquires something comparable to the continuity of a conventional sonata form theme.

A tendency towards a morphological reduction of the degree of narrativity seems evident from the genesis of the occurrences of *Event a* (the first theme). In fact, in their genesis there are few changes during the compositional process and, above all, some of their key passages have bars cancelled or discarded.

These cancellations and discardings happen at three points:

- the bars indicated with 240 a–f in Ex. 3.28, II, 63 (in square 1), present on pages I-DSS17, I-DSS21 and I-SS9 but later discarded on I-SS10 (Ex. 3.28, II, 63, square 2);
- the bars numbered with 229 a–f in Ex. 3.29, II, 64 (in the square), page I-SS10, cancelled perhaps to enhance the arrival of *Event x* occurrence (bars 244–252);
- bars 253–258 of I-SS9 (Ex. 3.25, II, 60, square 3), where probably Mahler had in mind

---

<sup>66</sup> The reader may notice the lack of these bars on these manuscript pages by the written indications (circled in red Ex. 3.27, II, 62 inserted by the transcriber: ‘weiter Takt 226’ and ‘weiter Takt 227’ (‘further bar 226/ 227’)

inserting an *Event b(x)* occurrence, as actually happens on the following page, I-SS11, at bars 258–259 (Ex. 3.25, II, square 1); these discarded bars of I-SS9 would have made the occurrence of *Event a* (bars 253–257) morphologically (a little bit) more fluent and continuous.

These cancellations and discardings then increase the motivic–thematic fragmentation of this idea.

In the dimension of semantics, the ‘recovery of memory’ emerges from the analysis of preparatory materials of some key passages. The compositional process of the coda thus suggests a progressive enhancement of the lyric dimension borne by the two themes, without a disturbing *Event y*. This ‘calmer recollection’ (or better, a ‘calm induced from a more fluent recollection’) pursued during the compositional process is suggested not only by the tempo indications added on I-DSS21 and I-SS10 but also from the chronology of the two occurrences of *Event b(x)* (bars 217–227 and bars 258–259). These are both (immediately as conceived in their first version) in a major key, in contrast to earlier in the movement when this event was always in a minor key. An interpretive reading of this might suggest that this calm seems liberating and caused by the recovery of musical ideas from what I metaphorically define as ‘the past of writing’. By this imaginative phrase I mean the retrieving of *Event b(x)*’s bars 217–227, on I-SS10, from the earliest sketches I-PSK3 and I-PSK4, after the discarding of these bars on pages I-DSS17, I-DSS19 and I-DSS20 (Ex. 3.27, II, 62).

The progressive improvement of ‘discursive’ narrative presentation of the basic musical ideas during the compositional process of the movement seems clear from the analysis of Micznik’s dimensions of narrative functions, gestural connotations and speed. This narrative strategy is especially evident when taking into consideration the construction of the gestural plot during the compositional process.

The morphological changes during the compositional process of *Event a* enhance its status as a nucleus. The deletion of bars mentioned in the previous section simplifies its harmonic pathway, although its melodic fragmentation even increases. The distance between this nucleus and the other—the second theme, *Event b(x)*—is reduced harmonically during the compositional process. In the earliest pages, I-PSK3 and I-PSK4 (RF 3), the *Event b(x)* occurrence at bars 217–227, is a fifth below, in the key of B major (Ex. 3.26, II, 61, square 1). On I-PSK4 (RF 4), Mahler transposes the passage into the key of F sharp major, the same as the occurrence of *Event a* (first theme) in this section (Ex. 3.26, II, 61, square 2).

Given the inclusion of *Event x* in the lyricism of *Event a* and *Event b(x)*, then, the semantic autonomy of events seems reduced, in a Bakhtinian monological sense. Thus, the occurrence of bars 244–252 of *Event x*, soon ‘temporalised’, at least partially, through a definite key, loses its nature of a catalyser. The semiquaver motive of *Event y* in the coda is included on its own, during the compositional process (via the recovery of I SKF3-4), to *Event b(x)* and so lacks the oppositional autonomy of the development section (Ex. 3.26, II, 61, where some occurrences of this semiquaver motive of *Event y* are circled). Therefore, I conclude that the coda is conceived almost completely free from catalysers. In other words, the indirect discourse now becomes direct, which seems to be a consequence of the recovery from ‘the past of writing’, evident in the ‘genetic story’ of *Event b(x)*’s occurrence in bars 217–227.

Subotnik’s ‘analogous structure’ (see p. 10), already glimpsed in the narratological analysis of the OD, becomes clearer and more detailed if studied across the stages of the compositional process. Like an anagnorisis (the Aristotelian ‘recognition of a character’), the second theme *Event b(x)*, bars 217–227 (Ex. 3.26, II, 61), emerges from the ‘past’ of the compositional process to emancipate itself from its role of supporting character and express its continuity, repressed until then. In the last stage of the compositional process, in contrast

to the exposition, this theme is fluent, and the first one is fragmentary and elliptical in its melodic unfolding. During the compositional process, the most fluent occurrence in the movement of *Event b(x)*, in bars 217–227—through a recourse to what I have defined above as ‘the past of writing’—the non-teleological sketches I-PSK3 and I-PSK4—has a difficult but ‘liberating’ genesis. In the OD, we see (or hear) a fluent occurrence of *Event b(x)* in bars 217–227, but below this tip of the iceberg is a compositional process which is, instead, laborious and difficult.

Crucial to this plot is Mahler’s strategy for the analytical dimension of gestural connotations. In this section of the movement the tonal pathway is conceived as freed from conventions and seems to follow a discursive plot. On I-SS10 (Ex. 3.26, II, 61), by ‘revealing’ itself in bars 217–227, *Event b(x)* ‘steals’ the D major key<sup>67</sup> from *Event x*’s occurrence in bars 244–252 (Ex. 3.28, II, 63, square 3) on I-DSS17, I-DSS21 and I-SS9, all conceived prior to that page I-SS10. Thus, *Event b(x)* ‘retaliates’ against *Event a*, already weakened by its morpho-syntactical uncertainty during the compositional process, manifested across the compositional process in the cancellation of many bars (Ex. 3.26, square 3, Ex.3.28, II, 63, squares 1 and 2, and Ex. 3.29, II, 64, in the square). In this way, in the subsequent rewriting of I-SS10 in the OD these bars were already discarded and the occurrence of *Event x* bars can finally be in the ‘right’ key of E flat major (bar 244). Bergquist (1980, p. 393) thinks that the reason for this choice is related to the tonal structure. In his view, if the passage had remained in D major, it would be a mix of major and minor thirds, and ‘since the character of the movement demands that the major mode prevails at the end [of the piece] this mixture of the third degree would be undesirable’ (Bergquist, 1980, p. 393). He adds the reason of ‘variety’, because D major occurs again in bar 259. In my view, the best

---

<sup>67</sup> Though in a chromatic context, this key seems ascribable to bars 221–224. Coburn (2002, p. 363) shares my opinion.

explanation for this passage is from outside of the tonal structure, with a narrative discursive strategy supported by the analysis of sketches and drafts. In the OD, using the key of D major only for *Event b(x)* contributes to its anagnorisis by rendering more discursively incisive the fluency of this idea, allowing Mahler to be more straightforward in the last part of the movement. In this view, also, the key of E flat major for the occurrence of *Event x* in bars 244–252 differentiates it from the two themes (both in F sharp major) and gives it a secondary, digressive position.

Concerning the duration of events, there is a tendency during the compositional process to shorten the occurrences of *Event a* (first theme), especially at the conception of *Event b(x)* (on I-SS9), to make room for the latter. This shortening of *Event a* seems significantly correlated to the emergence of the *Event b(x)* occurrence at bars 217–226 and to the relevant gestural connotation described above (p. 114). The addition of the occurrences of the second theme *Event b(x)* increases the section's frequency of events during the compositional process.

The numerous agogic indications added on pages I-DSS21, I-SS9 and I-SS10 (Ex. 3.28, II, 63) denote Mahler's intention to use the narratological dimension of the speed of the events in the articulation of the section's musical 'discourse'. The sense of these added indications seems to be that of highlighting, gesturally, the motivic–thematic fragmentation of this coda.

## 7. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the First Movement<sup>68</sup>

It is now time to consider the specific contours of meaning created by the process of narrativisation in the first movement. To answer this question, the first step is to identify

---

<sup>68</sup> I have published part of this section in Pinto, 2017, pp. 33–37.



Genette's 'whole of the real or fictional situation' in which Mahler's narrativisation takes place (Genette, 1972/1980, p. 28; see Chapter One, p. 40).

The analysis presented in the previous sections of this chapter has identified important aspects which are used so often within Mahler's narrativising activity that I consider them an essential component of Mahler's poetics in this movement. I refer to all of the movement's key passages, shown in sections 2–6, which suggest that the movement can represent a work-in-progress, a stylised compositional 'process within the product'<sup>69</sup> of the last compositional draft. From this point of view, it is strange but significant that Mahler, who often destroyed, for modesty and privacy, preparatory materials of his unfinished works,<sup>70</sup> seems to show in the Tenth's last compositional stage intentional traces of them—and even of the compositional process that generated them.

He gives to these traces an essential function in the overall 'narrative' he performed during the compositional process. In semiotic terms, the study of preparatory materials makes us think that without the denotative resource of verb conjugation, the narrative 'time' and 'voice' in this movement are represented, by importing the 'process' into the 'product', through intertextual and gestural means—that is, by representing in music, meta-referentially, the act of writing which is (or appears as) an act of memory. In other words, the movement's compositional process is meta-referentially 'scriptorial', aimed at representing in music a process of writing. It could be said that the Genettian 'whole of the real or fictional situation' seems to be a stylised fictional 'composing hut'—that is, not the physical object that Mahlerians can admire by going to Toblach, but rather a place of the mind of his creative process, of which listeners can find traces in the Symphony.

---

<sup>69</sup> To use McCallum's phrase (2009, pp. 123–150) again.

<sup>70</sup> At this purpose see the supporting testimony by Anna Bauer Lechner I quoted on p. 46, footnote 21.

Given these observations, I will detail these general assumptions as much as possible, articulating a teleology of this compositional purpose with representative pieces of evidence from the movement. Before this, however, I need to discuss another general premise linked to the contentious issue (raised briefly in Chapter One, section 6) of the possible presence of programmes in Mahler's music.

In programme music, the narrative pathway suggested by the verbal text in some cases completely replaces the absolute musical form (for example, the exposition, development and recapitulation of sonata form) in the presentation and organisation of the symphonic piece. In this situation, it happens by reversing the Adornian (Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 81) maxim on Mahler's music, which I will quote later—that it is the concreteness of the outwardness of the programme that assimilates the abstractness of the inwardness of music.

In Mahler's music, instead, the outwardness of narrative, which he pursues during the compositional process, does not replace the absolute musical forms; rather, it tends to assimilate them (with frequent conflicts and detachments). In other words, given Mahler's music's 'swallowing of the program' (according to Donald Mitchell, 2002),<sup>71</sup> by quoting Adorno's maxim in its original wording, it is always 'the inwardness of music [that] assimilate[s] the outward, instead of representing, externalizing, the inward' (Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 81). In this perspective, the recourse to traditional schemata—or better, what remains of them after a process of narrativisation during the compositional process—becomes the marker of the dominion of abstractness in Mahler's musical 'narration'.

Given these premises, I will frame my discussion in two narrative levels shown by the movement:

---

<sup>71</sup>In this essay, Mitchell refers to the aptitude of Mahler's music to absorb, in its abstractness, the program from which the composer's inspiration often departs (as happens, for example, in the First, Second and Third Symphonies).

- a) that of the ‘narrating’ voice;
- b) that of the ‘story’ narrated by this voice—the ‘diegesis’, according to Genette's definition (1972/1980).

Every event of the movement can be ascribed to each of the two levels, and so in what follows I will try to identify the ‘story’, ‘the signified or narrative content’ (Genette, 1972/1980, p. 28) that Mahler gave them while composing the movement. In light of the study of the compositional process, I will do this in constant relation to the remnants in the last compositional stage of the traditional scheme of sonata form, with the addition of the climax section: exposition (bars 1–111), development (bars 112–140), climax (bars 194–212), coda (bars 213–275).

During the movement, *Event x* can be ascribed the status of ‘voice’, the (a) level. In this view, what Johnson (2009, p. 29) says about the subjectivity of the ‘human voice’ of the idea *Event x* is, surprisingly, confirmed and further developed in the evidence from the ‘genetic’ analysis, read in light of Richard Kramer’s essay, *Unfinished Music* (2007). In fact, if *Event x* is morphologically quite stable in its occurrences (bars 1–15, 39–48, 104–111, 183–193) in the draft of the last compositional stage, and also across the compositional process there are few changes. This genetic story of *Event x* can be inferred by the compositional chronology of these occurrences (Table 3.5, II, 65).

The absence of major changes in *Event x* during the compositional process seems to put this idea in the category of Richard Kramer’s ‘draft-like’ music (see Chapter One, p. 31). In other words, I believe it is possible to read the ‘unfinished’ and tentative *Event x*<sup>72</sup> in light of what Richard Kramer says about the first movement of Beethoven’s ‘*Tempest*’ Sonata: ‘the process itself, the act of composing infiltrates the substance of the work’ (Kramer, 2007,

---

<sup>72</sup> In Barthesian terms (1966/1977, p. 146), this idea can be qualified as a ‘field without origin’.

p. 201). Like that composition, Mahler's movement begins with a draft-like introduction, not merely external to the movement but entering (in the Tenth's case, taking the form of a refrain) into the movement, acting as a theme. In this piece, too, the 'subjective figuring of Mahler's voice—of Mahler as protagonist' (Kramer, 2007, p. 171)—is a deliberately unrefined, undrafted gesture of *Event x*. As in Beethoven's '*Tempest*' Sonata, so in this movement the authorial presence is represented by a similar draft-like, meta-referential gesture, characterised by an introduction that seems temporally collocated in a moment different to that of the rest of the movement.

Unlike in Beethoven's sonata, though, in this Symphony Mahler provides more temporal indicators, thanks to a higher degree of narrativity. Thus, the 'present tense' (the moment of writing or recollecting an idea, which I metaphorically call 'the composing hut') is represented by a stylistic borrowing of a tonally ambiguous/chromatic music. This event's character then contrasts with that of the nostalgic reminiscence of more typically Mahlerian ideas (the two themes) that *Event x* introduces during the movement. Hence, *Event x* can be imaginatively defined as the 'quill', mentioned in Mahler's poem addressed to Alma (mentioned in Chapter Two, p. 71). It moves to note an uncertain,<sup>73</sup> unfinished melody searching for the right temporal focus of the memory of past happenings that he is going to narrate. This stylised uncertainty of this musical idea seems to correspond to Mahler's difficulty of inspiration (perhaps writer's block) at the moment of starting to compose this Symphony. This is suggested by the poem Mahler wrote to Alma, dated by her '17 August 1910': 'Die Zeit is da, die Feder ist zur Hand- / Doch die Gedanken wollen nicht verweilen' ('The time has come, the quill is in my hand—*Yet this idea continually eludes me*'<sup>74</sup>).

At the same time, it is evident that *Event x* works at Genette's extra-diegetic level: it is a

---

<sup>73</sup> For this purpose, the annotation in the OD at bar 184, '*etwas zögernd*' ('slightly hesitant'), is significant.

<sup>74</sup> Translation by Antony Beaumont, in GMAB, 2004, p. 377, no. 329; emphasis mine.

subjective narrating element that suggests the authorial voice. So, during the compositional process, Mahler creates this ‘author’— *Event x* —of the story of *Event a* and *Event b(x)* that follows. However, this author wishes to give an impression of objective neutrality— suggested by the annotations ‘*ohne Ausdruck*’ on I-DSS7. *Event x* ‘creates’ the story he is telling by its materials (Coburn’s motives 1–4; also used for themes *Event a*, *Event b(x)* and motive *Event y*), but not from nothing. The author knows the story in advance, as suggested by *Event x*’s being the motivic ‘source’ of *Event a* and *Event b(x)*, but he attempts (with difficulty) to remember this ‘story’ through a formulaic, almost immutable, melodic unfolding. The intrusion of the ‘composer’s voice’ into his piece is indirect. That is, given the low denotation and referentiality of music, the subject cannot manifest by naming himself or by using verb tenses, but only by the ideographical proxy of representation of what he is doing as he writes (by the ‘andante—quill’). It is Barthes’s ‘hand, cut off from any voice’ (Barthes, 1967/1977, p. 1), but also the ‘hand that ever held me’ of the poem, dated 17 August, to Alma (GMAB, 2004, no. 330).

*Event x*’s occurrence at the opening of the movement is equivalent to ‘once upon a time, there was a Sonata,’ which Adorno (1960/1992, p. 96) identifies in the introduction of the Fourth. In that Symphony, however, the introductory gesture is brief, the act of recalling (if it is such) is more straightforward, the following sonata is more traditionally intended in its Haydenesque or Mozartian references (via Schubert), and its form is more polite. The narrator reports without hesitation or effort ‘the imago of the gipsy wagon and the ship’s cabin’ as Adorno imaginatively calls it (1960/1992, p. 55).

In the Tenth Symphony, instead, the ‘time’ that follows *Event x*’s introductory gesture is different, and the ‘story’ of the sonata is recalled with difficulty (or the narrator’s resistance). Mahler leaves in the OD some enigmatic and isolated traces of this effort: the ‘stuttering memory’, Bergquist’s displacements, and the interruption of *Event a* by *Event y* at bar 28 (see

Ex. 3.9, II, 29). However, the preparatory materials show more evidence of this difficulty. The ‘stuttering memory’, introduced within *Event a* only from page I-DSS5 (see red circles in Ex. 3.16, II, 43; bars 18, 19) assumes a meta-referential function. In other words, they express, in the last compositional stage, Mahler’s difficulty—seen in the laborious compositional process—in fluently ‘telling’ this theme. Concerning the genesis of this theme, the impulse and the effort to recall and narrate cathartically in music are evident in the difficulty during the compositional process of defining a ‘before’ and ‘after’. The annotation ‘*1/2 ton tiefer*’ on I-DSS7 and the frequent changes of octaves during the compositional process represent a difficulty of musically focusing the ‘right’ pitches in the memory. Finally, at the last stage of the compositional process (the OD) the ‘telling’ assumes a thematically fluent form, closer to the thematic symmetry of a conventional sonata theme. If only the last, nearly definitive, compositional draft is considered, then it is difficult to explain these enigmatic traces of memory and forgetting. In fact, most markers of Mahler’s difficulty in remembering lie beneath the tip of the iceberg of the OD, in preparatory sketches and drafts. Only by invoking Mahler’s ‘past of writing’, through the analysis of narrativity during the compositional process, do these traces above the iceberg become part of a whole, a coherent narrativising and meta-referential ploy. A similar fate befalls *Event b(x)*: after just two bars it is interrupted at bar 34 by *Event y* (containing the trill-motive). The compositional process of the second theme *Event b(x)* has few changes. So, in *Event b(x)*’s occurrences<sup>75</sup> is detectable a lesser gestural differentiation between different versions of their compositional process than in that of the occurrences of *Event a*. Moreover, the compositional process of this *Event b(x)*, always compared to that of *Event a*, appears to lack fluidity given that its short occurrences are often interrupted in their

---

<sup>75</sup> I refer especially to the occurrences of *Event b(x)* at bars 32–33 (shown in Ex. 3.17, II, 44),<sup>75</sup> 81–84 (on I-DSS9, I-SS2 and the OD) and 96–97 (on I-DSS9, I-SS2 and the OD).

unfolding by *Event y*, for example, at bar 34 (Ex. 3.17, II, 44). As a result, the effort of remembering of *Event b(x)* is less successful—or, better, the authorial voice makes less an effort than for *Event a* to remember or to tell something in the music. This aspect sounds like a Freudian displacement (whose expression in the text is the trill-motive + *Event y*, bars 34–39) of a thematic fluency of this theme which will unfold only at the end of the movement.

To sum up, the eventual fluency of *Event a* is the result of difficult compositional work, in which its numerous changes show Mahler's difficulty in focusing on the event (see the swapping of bars, the changes of octaves). In *Event b(x)*, Mahler makes few changes during the compositional process, so he gives up recovering this event from the 'past of writing', which remains almost completely in the darkness of oblivion, as suggested by the interrupting trill-motive + *Event y* at bar 34. All of these elements, above the tip of the iceberg of the OD, work as meta-referential markers, which are remnants within the *product* of the difficult compositional *process*, using MacCallum's terms (2008, pp. 123–150) again.

The words of Mahler's letter-poem, 'this idea continually eludes me', addressed to Alma,<sup>76</sup> confirm this reading. This phrase seems not only a heartfelt confession to Alma of his difficulty of working in that problematic period of his life, but expresses more specifically Mahler's purpose in representing this problematic writing process.

Within the exposition, the motivic similarity of *Event x* and *Event b(x)*, which I have signalled by the letter 'x' in brackets near 'b', is remarkable. Earlier in this chapter (p. 99), I defined *Event b(x)* as a 'temporalised x', given that the former is in a clear key (F sharp minor) and the latter is tonally ambiguous/chromatic. These considerations open the door to a more precise narrative function of *Event b(x)*, and also to that of *Event x*. Through *Event*

---

<sup>76</sup> GMAB, 2004, p. 377.

*b(x)*, the ‘narrator’ *Event x* ‘enters’ the story, so that in Genette’s terms (1972/1980, p. 245) he can be defined as ‘homodiegetic’ with an ‘internal focalisation’ (1972/1980, p. 201)—like the narrator of Proust’s *Recherche*. In other words, *Event x* impassively narrates a given time of an earlier story which includes himself (although in transient apparitions until the coda).

*Event y* has another remarkable role in the ‘story’ of the movement. Like *Event x*, *Event y* is a catalyser, but it operates internally to the diegetic level of ‘story’; it is a clear example of Almén’s agentiality/actantiality across the movement. In the exposition, *Event y*, as a catalyser, delays the ‘narrative’ of the movement and leads it astray. This musical idea disturbs the unfolding of the first and, especially, the second theme. This agentiality can also be read ‘by proxy’ of the narrator *Event x*, with which *Event y* shares Coburn’s cell 1 (Ex. 3.10, II, 31). With this cell, the narrator *Event x* seems to want to suppress, in a Freudian sense, the traumatic memory of the two themes.

In the development (bars 112–140), the reference to the syntactic discursive function of the development of conventional sonata form works particularly well. This feature is facilitated by the traditional fragmented nature of this section in sonata form. Nonetheless, compared to traditional forms, here an oppositional nature is particularly evident and enhanced by the agential status of *Event y*; during the compositional process, Mahler then makes the basic musical ideas of the section gestural and semantically autonomous.

In the exposition and development, during the compositional process Mahler has wanted to make *Event y* interruptive and suppressive (in the Freudian sense suggested above) of the two themes, whose occurrences last only a few bars. One of these occurrences, *Event b(x)*’s bars 147–150 (Ex. 3.18, II, 47 square 2) is significant. Here Mahler adds the ‘stuttering memory’ (Coburn’s cell 4, in bars 147–149) on I-DSS14 as a meta-referential marker by which Mahler seems to make the listener aware that such an occurrence is difficult to remove



from his musical memory. However, this difficulty is more visible in the previous compositional stages, given that in the earliest conception of this occurrence (Ex. 3.18, II, 47, square 1), on I-DSS13, this event is almost absent (or in any case, difficult to recognise). The movement's two sections (especially the development) then seem conceived with the purpose of conducting the listener to a place far from musical memory, represented by the semantically and gesturally more stable two themes. It seems certain that, by contrast, this distancing of the listener from the 'story' highlights the more fluent 'reconciling' occurrences of the two themes of bars 213–275.

The gesturality of the climax characterises a different (stronger and more direct) degree of subjectivity compared to *Event x*, as suggested by the violence of the sounds of *Event c1* and *Event c2*. In the OD, the passage from *Event x* to *c* exhibits the huge discontinuity of an Adornian *Durchbruch*. However, the compositional process tells us something completely different. Concerning Micznik's 'discourse', from versions 1 to 6 (Table 3.3, II, 56) there is a *gradual* pathway of progressive addition and stabilisation of new musical ideas that work in the last compositional stage as if they were memories located in a different, earlier, time than *Event a* and *Event b(x)*. As shown in Table 3.3, II, 56, in early versions at the same place, in the column 'Discourse position 2', we find prolongations of a static section *Event x* (*Event x'* and *Event x''* in versions 2 and 3). Then in version 4 there are the more gesturally defined *Event y* (as a 'catalyser') and finally *Event c1* (as a 'nucleus' in versions 2 and 3). We should also note that *Event x'* and *Event x''*, play a sort of bridging function, thanks to their melodic material ascribable to *Event x*, between the gestural connotation of *Event x* and that of the nascent *Orgelklang* idea. In versions 4, 5 and 6 of the same 'Discourse position 2', Mahler has removed the melodic material of *Event x'* and *Event x''/I* that is ascribable to *Event x*. The surprising effect is enhanced by the fact that, unlike earlier in the movement (bars 15–16, 48–49, 108–110), this time the introduction–refrain *Event x* introduces an idea

(*Event c1*) which bears no melodic resemblance to it.

Therefore, Mahler's laborious effort to focus *Event c1* during the compositional process confirms the character of this idea as a painful flashback memory. This aspect is also suggested by the fact that *Event y* works like a Freudian displacement and suppression of traumatic memory. Thus, in version 4, *Event x'* is replaced by *Event y*, which is also clearly comparable to a verbal temporal connective, thanks to its 'streaming' character. Before arriving at the terrible *Event c1* (in version 5), Mahler hesitates and pushes forward by spinning the 'wheel of time', so as not to reawaken the painful memory of *Event c1*. In version 5, then, the postponement of *Event y* after *Event c1* enhances the temporal connective role of *Event y* to lead the musical representation of time towards a 'then'—the still more terrible *Event c2*. This temporal shift is also suggested by the nine-note chord to represent a temporal plane, which in its dissonant modernity conveys the idea of an event that is more recent than the 'modal' *Event c1*, although linked with the latter by painful religious (and this time more personal) references.<sup>77</sup> Thanks to the study of the compositional process, the apparently rock-like monolithic climax shows its internal articulation.

The return to the narrative time representation of the two themes happens in the coda (bars 213–275). Mahler ascribed to this section the traditional function of the sonata form's recapitulation: overcoming the dramatic conflict of development and restoring the initial balance of the exposition. The actual recapitulation of the movement (bars 141–193) however, has a developmental character because of the oppositional character of *Event y*, which overlaps *Event b(x)*'s occurrences. Here in the coda, decisive hermeneutic input for

---

<sup>77</sup> The bars of this event, according to the chronology of Chapter Two, section 5 were conceived in the SS only after Gropius's letter while composing the fifth movement.

this section again comes from analysis of sketches and drafts; the recovery of memory from the ‘past of writing’ and a meta-referential representation of the compositional process play a key role. During the compositional process, *Event b(x)*’s occurrence at bars 217–227, the longest-lasting of the movement, reaches its full fluency only with difficulty, like the occurrence of *Event a* in the exposition. The recovery from the ‘past of writing’ happens from the non-teleological sketches I-PSK3 and I-PSK4. Mahler highlights the importance of this difficult recovery by the ‘theft’ of the key of D major by *Event b(x)* at bars 221–224 on I-SS10 (via pages I-PSK3, I-PSK4), to *Event x*’s occurrence (bars 244–252) on I-DSS17 and I-DSS21, all conceived prior to page I-SS10. In this ‘theft’, in the long duration and in a non-oppositional *Event y* motive during the occurrence at bars 217–225, we can identify meta-referential markers. In other words, in these traces, the author is telling us that this recovery is liberating after the asperities of the previous *Event b(x)* occurrences interrupted by *Event y* and after the laborious compositional process of bars 217–227.

This cathartic liberation makes the occurrence of *Event x* at bars 244–252 ‘temporalised’, since in the earliest page (I-DSS17) Mahler ascribed a clear key (instead of the tonal ambiguity/chromaticism of the previous occurrences of *Event x*). Above all, however, *Event x* is made a ‘temporalised’ part of the diegetic level of the ‘story’ it tells, and this becomes a marker of a complete integration of narrator with the story he is telling.

Already in the exposition, development and recapitulation, the narrator attempted to achieve this integration with the previous occurrences of *Event b(x)*, but he was unsuccessful because they were always short and interrupted by *Event y*. Thus, the Ecovian ‘intention of the text’ provided by my analysis suggests itself as a ‘control horizon’ for other possible interpretations. Put simply, Mahler seems to have intended to make the liberation of *Event b(x)* the final version of this movement. The movement’s ‘programme swallowed by

music'<sup>78</sup> seems that of *Event x*, acting as a Genettian narrator, through its intradiegetic alter ego—*Event b(x)*—finally constructing his coveted identity after numerous failed attempts, I can say by using Johnson's construct (2009, p. 29). In the next chapters, I will determine whether this reading is applicable to the other movements and to the Symphony as a whole.

---

<sup>78</sup> By this phrase, I refer here to the concept of Mahler's 'swallowing of the program' by Mitchell, 2002 I quoted early on p. 117.

# Chapter Four. Narrativity and Narrativisation in the Second Movement

In this chapter I will apply my ‘genetic’ apparatus to the second movement. By borrowing Micznik’s analysis of Mahler’s Ninth (2001) as a theoretical framework, I will find my interpretative key of the movement by considering ideas taken from writings specifically dedicated to this movement by Coburn (2002), Rothkamm (2003), Cooke (1963), Floros (1977) and others. In sections 1 and 2 of this chapter I will analyse the movement’s OD. Then in sections 3–5, within each of the movement’s large formal areas, I will apply my analytical technique to the entire compositional process, including all existing manuscript drafts and sketches. In this way, from the narrativity of genetic versions of the movement’s basic musical ideas, I will infer their diachronic process of narrativisation.

In section 6 I will put the outcomes of the previous sections in a broader hermeneutic framework to suggest Mahler’s overall narrative intention during the compositional process (according to Eco’s model of the ‘intention of author’). In this way, the chapter suggests that the movement, although possessing a lower degree of narrativity than the first movement, reveals a clear effort by Mahler to build a narrative plot. In this plot, I detect Genette’s narrator’s voice in a meta-referential representation of a process of writing.

## 1. The Analysis of the ‘Story’ Level

At Micznik’s paradigmatic level of ‘story’, the movement’s basic musical ideas—thanks to their morpho-syntactic and semantic autonomy—are comparable to narrative events. Additionally, the movement presents morpho-syntactic narrative aspects, already detected

in the first movement, of ‘diseconomy of materials’, gestural contrast and Almén’s agential emancipation of musical ideas. From this movement onwards in the Symphony, however, what I define as ‘motivic hybridity’ is clearly evident. This means that each of the events of the movement is composed of semantically non-autonomous basic motivic units, and these recur autonomously in other events. According to Rothkamm (2003, pp. 114–115, 118, 120), these basic, semantically non-autonomous motivic materials can be arranged into four groups (from here on I will call them ‘*Groups I–IV*’), whose most important occurrences are indicated in Ex. 4.1, II, 67–69. *Groups I* and *II* prevail in the scherzo’s basic idea, which I call ‘*Scherzo Event*’, presented for the first time in bars 1–164. This comprises ‘*Scherzo Event a*’ (its first occurrence is in bars 1–22, Ex. 4.2, II, 70–71) and ‘*Scherzo Event b*’ (its first occurrence is at bars 76–96, Ex. 4.3, II, 72). *Group IV* prevails in the trio’s basic idea, which I call ‘*Trio Event c*’, presented first at bars 165–245 (Ex. 4.4, II, 73).<sup>79</sup> For the other occurrences of *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c*, see Table 4.1, II, 77–79.<sup>80</sup> *Group III* motive seems to be the most commonly found.<sup>81</sup> In fact, it occurs within both *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c* until it becomes gesturally autonomous and individualised in two occurrences at bars 416–443 and at bars 469–477. I label these two occurrences, respectively, ‘*Event d(c)1*’ (Ex. 4.5, II, 74) and ‘*Event d(c)2*’ (Ex. 4.6, II, 75).<sup>82</sup>

Given the ‘motivic hybridity’ during the movement, the morphological distinction between *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c* occurrences is obtained by sudden, unprepared

---

<sup>79</sup> From here on I will indicate the occurrence of Scherzo and *Trio Event* with numerals, e.g.: ‘*Scherzo Event 1*’ (to indicate the first occurrence of *Scherzo Event*).

<sup>80</sup> Also this table, similarly to Tables 3.1 (II, 37–39), 5.3 (II, 113–115), 6.2 (II, 130–135), 7.1 (II, 176–178), presents several different levels of formal analysis of the entire movement with my formal analysis related to previous analogous attempts made by other scholars.

<sup>81</sup> Most of the times, from here on, I use the phrase ‘*Group III* motive’ to mean a single entity, instead of ‘*Group III*’, given that this motive, differently from the others belonging to other *Groups*, often occurs almost unchanged during the movement (Ex. 4.1, II, 68).

<sup>82</sup> The letter ‘*c*’ inside these labels refers to these sections’ use of the motivic materials of *Trio Event* (previously identified by this letter).

gestural contrasts between them. Another important morphological feature of the movement is that until the arrival of *Event d(c)1* at bars 416–443, *Scherzo Event a*, *Scherzo Event b* and *Trio Event c* recur in sequences of ‘modular’ juxtaposing of one or more restatements of the first presentation of each of these events (Table 4.1, II, 77–79).

Within *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c* blocks, the main marker of narrative ‘diseconomy’ is the peculiar rhythmic treatment of these motivic materials. As Rothkamm (2003, p. 116) points out, cells and motives frequently recur in new rhythmic patterns with changes of time signature at almost every bar. So, the different durations and accentuations preclude any predictability for the listener. According to Micznik (2001, p. 204), in Beethoven’s Sixth, once cells are defined through their ‘morphological features through stable primary parameters of interval content rhythm and/or implied harmony or through combinations of those parameters’, they remain ‘every time they are used’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 204). Here, however, it is evident that when cells and motives remain melodically stable, they always change rhythmically. In these morphological aspects it is possible to see Prince’s markers of narratology (Prince, 1982, p. 145): the coexistence of several time sequences (or the impression of time changes) and the presence of their conflict.

As with the first movement, here there is a process of thematic emancipation of motives—in this case, *Group III motive*. In fact, its ubiquitous occurrences can help us understand this process, which is particularly significant in the movement. A motive of this *Group* appears for the first time within *Scherzo Event 1* (and precisely in *Scherzo Event a* at bars 17–22, Ex. 4.2, II, 71, in the square<sup>83</sup>). Here *Group III motive* is completely integrated

---

<sup>83</sup> I connect bars 17–22 to Rothkamm’s *Group III motive* because of the dotted rhythmic profile, which is presented both twice in this passage (bars 17 and 19) and also in all the occurrences shown in ex. 4.1, II, 68 of this group during the movement. I remark that this motive in bars 17–22 is not included in Rothkamm’s inventory (shown in ex. 4.1, II, 68) because it presents only the most important occurrences of each group, as I have pointed out on p. 129.

into *Scherzo Event 1* and indistinguishable within the orchestral tutti. But this event is absent—in an incomplete symmetry—in the very similar restatement of *Scherzo Event a* at bars 41–42 in the homologous climax. A later appearance of *Group III motive* occurs in *Trio Event c1* at bars 192–194. Also, here it is completely integrated, as a pivot, between two almost identical sections (which constitute a ‘hurdy-gurdy’ topic, according to Cooke, 1963 p. 15, as explained below) in bars 186–191 and 195–201. But in the restatement of *Trio Event c1* (bars 202–245) this motive is completely absent. Likewise, this motive is integrated into *Scherzo Event 2* at bars 266–268. And again, at bar 320 it is still a part of *Trio Event c2* but is extended and more autonomous, although always within a *Trio Event c* gesture. Also, it detaches from the ‘hurdy-gurdy’ episode, which is presented alone in bars 348–358. It is only in the coda in *Event d(c)1* (bars 416–443) that, as above, this idea acquires complete autonomy by dominating the section that also uses *Trio Event c* materials. It is in this Adornian ‘Suspension’ (theorised in Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 41) that due to different durations there is sudden temporal change (which in Cooke's edition is correctly indicated with ‘*plötzlich gehalten*’, ‘suddenly held’ at bar 416) brusquely interrupting *Scherzo Event 3*. As indicated by de La Grange (2008, p. 1508), the section uses *Trio Event c* materials—although, in a conflict between parameters, it lacks the homonymic accompaniment that characterises the previous *Trio Event c* occurrences. In its place there is a long pedal of trombones and bass tubas at bars 416–422, and again, these same instruments and double basses at bars 435–438. But the highest degree of gestural autonomy of this idea is acquired later in *Event d(c)2*, at bars 469–477, where the gestural-temporal change is even stronger than in *Event d(c)1*. Because of its greater fluency, then, *Event d(c)2* seems a ‘completion’ of *Event d(c)1*. Here also, in spite of the use of *Trio Event c*'s motivic material, the tremolo



accompaniment<sup>84</sup> and the above-mentioned fluency of *Group III* motivic materials make this section autonomous, like *Event d(c)1*. *Group III* motive also recurs, as a secondary musical idea, in the coda, within the occurrences of *Scherzo Event* (bars 444–468) and *Trio Event c* (bars 492–502). However, after the Adornian *Suspension* of *Event d(c)1* and *Trio Event c* (bars 492–502), *Group III* motive suddenly disappears in the final recapitulative peroration of bars 503–522. At a morpho-syntactic level, *Group III* motive can certainly be defined as ‘agential’, according to Almén’s definition (see p. 16).

Turning to semantics, *Scherzo Event* (*Scherzo Event a* + *Scherzo Event b*) is distinguished by a feverish, fiery rhythmic organisation that gives it a character of ‘fierce material’ (Cooke, 1963, p. 15). The peculiar rhythmic features of this idea lead Rothkamm to describe it as an ‘unruly, almost out of tune dance’, a ‘popular’ rather than the ‘courtly’ type (2003, p. 136). In addition to being heard as ‘unruly’, this topic could also be heard as ‘clumsy’. In my opinion, however, *Scherzo Event* effectively represents the expressive paradigm of the Adornian *Weltlauf* (Adorno, 1960/1992, p. 6). This incessantly rhythmic, compulsive movement seems out of control and, as a result, needs to be stopped suddenly, without morphologic, syntactic mediation by the more regular movement of *Trio Event*. By using the intertextual perspective I have already applied to the first movement, *Scherzo Event* in its pre-Stravinskian rhythmic modernism positions itself in a ‘present time’ of musical discourse.

On its own, the consolatory Other interrupting the *Weltlauf* in this movement is represented by *Trio Event c* and *Event d(c)1–2*. *Trio Event c* is distinguished by a topic Cooke (1963, p. 15) defines as ‘a gay pastoral music’. Within this topic, he further

---

<sup>84</sup> I agree with Cooke’s edition (1989), which interprets the sign of repetition of the tremolo at bar 470 as referring in shorthand to the entire section *Event d(c)2*.

distinguishes the topics ‘*Ländler*’ (bars 165–185 and 202–234) and ‘hurdy-gurdy’ (bars 186–201 and 235–245) (Cooke, 1963, pp. 15, 77). Rothkamm (2003, p. 13) classifies *Trio Event c* as a whole as a *Ländler*, distinguishing between the two types of materials identified by Floros (1977, p. 173) in Mahler’s *Scherzos*. There are ‘slow’ and ‘leisurely’ *Ländler*: the latter type is characterised by accentuated rhythms, rich ornamentation, and melody favouring small intervals; the former is cantilevered and floating (Floros, 1977, p. 177). In this way, Rothkamm also helps identify semantic changes across the occurrences of this idea. In fact, occurrences of *Groups IV* and *IVb* (Ex. 4.1, II, 69) are ascribable to the ‘slow’ type, where *IVa* is a ‘leisurely’ *Ländler*. By applying the perspective Samuels uses for a passage of Mahler’s Fourth Symphony, I can say that the idyllic, nostalgic colour of *Trio Event c/Ländler* sounds chronologically regressive, a step behind the diegetic temporal level of the chaotic dance of *Scherzo Event*. This idea is not immune to an artificial deformation of its discursive conventional model. For this perspective, see the beginning of *Trio Event c*’s occurrence at bars 165–201, which is a kind of ‘false start’. Here the discursive pattern seems to be the well-worn scheme of melody and accompaniment. But the melody of Violin I begins at bar 165 with a triadic accompaniment formula, followed by an empty bar, 166, then restarting on the same instrument again with the accompaniment formula, and then finally with the ‘actual’ beginning of the melody at bar 168. The same scheme is followed in the restatement of *Trio Event c* at bars 202–206 (Ex. 4.7, II, 76, in the square).

Both occurrences of *Event d(c)*, but especially the second one, are semantically distinguished by a melody and its counter-melody, which in their artificial banality—as in the post-horn episode of the Third Symphony—adopt the guise of a childlike, enchanted world. With these two enigmatic sections, however, the door of this world is opened twice, and both times it is immediately closed. In Freudian terms, I would say that this perhaps painful recalling of the distant past is soon suppressed by the return (at bars 444–468 and

478–491) of the chaotic, agitated present, ultimately culminating in an artificial, and maybe manic, prevailing joy. In this context, even the reprise of *Trio Event c* material (492–502) is completely integrated semantically, for hybridity, into that character of *Scherzo Event*.

By using Samuels's intuitions on a passage of Mahler's Fourth once more, episodes *Event d(c)1* and *Event d(c)2*, both of which seem to refer to the same diegetic temporal level, locate their temporal reference two steps earlier than that of *Trio Event c*. What is evoked is an even more distant past—the childlike world—preceding the time-frame of *Trio Event c* from which this section's morphology (partially) comes. The episodes are enigmatic and manifest a character of Adornian *Suspension*. Their sudden gestural change interrupts *Scherzo Event*'s incessant movement. Hans-Heinrich Eggebrecht claims that in the Third Symphony's Scherzo, the interruption of one of scherzo sections by the post horn, in an episode that is a true moment of Adornian *Suspension*, represents the Other compared to the world of animals, represented in those sections (Eggebrecht, 1982, p. 173). The Scherzo of the Third Symphony is feverish, in the same manner as in this movement.

## 2. The Analysis of the 'Discourse' Level

Having identified the morpho-syntactically and semantically autonomous ideas of the movement, the next step of my pathway—the 'discourse' level—is to argue the analogy of their syntagmatic unfolding during the movement with that of narrative events. More specifically, the aim of this section is to detect in the movement the narrative dimensions invoked by Micznik: narrative functions, gestural connotations and temporal discursive processes. As with my analysis of the first movement, the starting point of this analysis of narrativity is the comparison of the actual unfolding of the movement with the ideal formal schemes and the discursive and temporal parameters established at the beginning of the

movement. In this perspective, the conventional paradigm of the scherzo form requires a predictable and quite regular return of the scherzo and trio sections, at the largest scale, syntactically, the movement confirms this traditional scheme of scherzo form, in an apparently recognisable, clear-cut and ‘modular’ articulation, given by sudden gestural changes without mediation between sections.

As with the first movement of Mahler’s Ninth Symphony, according to Micznik’s analysis, a key narrative feature is the fact that superimposed onto this traditional conventional scheme is a conflicting teleological plot determined by semantic changes that work as Subotnik’s ‘analogous structure’. It can be translated into the verbal narrative of my presentation as the ‘gradual resurfacing of the past’, given in *Trio Event c* by the occurrences of *Group III motive* until a deeper unveiling of a more distant past represented by *Event d(c)1–2* sections. This superimposition inevitably unbalances the movement’s conventional formal pattern based on a regular return of the scherzo and trio sections. In fact, in the movement’s lengthy coda (bars 416–522), the feverish rhythmic movement of *Scherzo Event*’s *Weltlauf* is interrupted by two waves of timelessness of *Event d(c)1* and *Event d(c)2*.

From *Event d(c)1* on, the ‘motivic hybridity’ increases, and the musical ‘discourse’ is less recognisable as an alternation of scherzo and trio sections. According to Coburn (2001, p. 184), in the coda there is a recognisably recto–verso formal scheme—considering, as Coburn does, those I label *Event d(c)1* and *Event d(c)2* as entirely ascribable to Trio Event *c*. I can translate this scheme in my labelling system in this way (see also Table 4.1, II, 79):

- *Event d(c)1*, *Scherzo Event a* + *Scherzo Event b*;
- *Event d(c)2*, *Scherzo Event a* + *Scherzo Event b*, *Trio Event c*;
- *Scherzo Event a* + *Scherzo Event b*, *Trio Event c*.

The musical discourse begins as ‘prismatic’ and then, from *Event d(c)1* on, becomes ‘kaleidoscopic’: *Group III motive* gains autonomy from the occurrences of *Trio Event c*, expanding to become the ‘protagonist’ of *Event d(c)1–2*. This process has its climax in *Event d(c)2*, as a more complete and fluent memory than that of the still fragmentary gesture of *Event d(c)1*. The arrival of this distant memory generates a lengthening of the ‘discourse’. The difficulty of finishing, typical of many Mahler’s symphonic works, can here be traced back to a musical ‘discourse’ before *Event d(c)1* and *Event d(c)2*, in the dialectics between *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c*, finally mediated in the movement’s long coda. Thanks to its process of growing, this essential contribution to the gestural narrative plot of *Group III motive* makes this idea an ‘actor’, according to Almén’s theory.

In contrast to other movements, Subotnik’s ‘analogous’ discursive semantic structure is articulated in the absence of narrative syntactic functions identifiable as Barthesian ‘catalysers’ (1977, pp. 93–97). The two candidate sections—the suspensive *Event d(c)1* and *Event d(c)2*—possess strong gestural differentiation from other events, but do not seem to connect to cardinal functions. Rather, they seem to have such functions on their own. This movement’s lack of connective functions does not imply that it falls into mere mimesis. What kind of mimesis is it in which time, action and, possibly, the place change within a few seconds of hypothetical play, as suggested by a sudden change of tempos and gestures between *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c/Event d(c)1–2* sections? Rather, in this situation, the play of the temporal sequence of musical events is recognisable in terms of a past-oriented strophic narrative technique. This is due to the ‘regressive’ semantic transformation of *Trio Event c* in *Event d(c)1–2*, in a dialectic relationship between this semantic variability and *Scherzo Event*’s semantic stability. Instead, the gestural connotations of the movement

are numerous. More specifically, the articulation of *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c* is not determined as per tonal conventions; in other terms, their dialectic is not based on their different keys (F sharp major/minor of *Scherzo Event* and E flat major of *Trio Event*), but rather by the semantic and gestural contrast between them. Another significant gestural connotation is in *Event d(c)1*, which presents *Trio Event c* material in one of the keys of *Scherzo Event* (F sharp major). At first glance, this choice can seem almost indifferent to the conventional tonal contrast, whose syntactic role is entirely nullified by the most recognisable gesture of the movement, that of *Event d(c)1–2*.

The strategy here is really more complex and consists of a subordination of the tonal plan to a narrative plot. Using this key of *Scherzo Event* incoherently (according to tonal contrast required by conventions) for the section *Event d(c)1*, its *Trio Event c* material creates suspense in the listener. This suspense, then, will be resolved by the return of *Event d(c)2* in the ‘appropriately’ contrasting key of D major (because of its previous use in *Trio Event c2*, bars 331–365). But the solution is only partial since, although *Event d(c)2* is more complete than *Event d(c)1*, it is likewise unfinished in being interrupted—like that section—by the impetuous return of *Scherzo Event* (at bar 478). Perhaps it is this discordance between gestural definition and the fact that in the last presentation of *Trio Event c* (bars 514–520) the key is absorbed into the *Scherzo Event* area of F sharp, making the final peroration (bars 503–522) ‘artificial’ and not effective in finishing the movement.

The events of the movement do not follow the duration, frequency, speed and order of ‘ideal temporal discursive schemes (which consist of older formal models, generic schemes or an expected expressive pattern)’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 235). The movement’s events do not even follow the temporal patterns Mahler established at the beginning of the movement. These temporal diversions seem coordinated to depict the above plot. In fact, concerning the

duration of events, the movement begins with a lengthy presentation of *Scherzo Event 1* and *Trio Event c1* (bars 1–164 and 165–245, respectively). These, in the following presentation, have a shorter duration that falls literally right after the suspension of section *Event d(c)1* in an increasingly fragmented musical ‘discourse’. Similarly, there is an evident increase in the frequency of events before and after this suspension. With regards to the speed of events, the last stage of existing materials (OD), given its incompleteness, shows few indications. In any case, numerous changes of tempo are implicit in the gestural contrasts of the movement, as correctly understood and expressed in verbal indications of dynamics and tempo in Cooke’s edition (1976).

The coda does not respect the order of events established by both convention and the beginning of the movement. In fact, according to a conventional discursive order, after *Scherzo Event 3* the listener expects to hear its companion, *Trio Event*. Instead, there is *Event d(c)1* which, because of the rift of its gestural contrast, sounds like the starting point of a new strophic cycle paired with the interruptive (because of its gestural contrast) *Scherzo Event a + b* section (bars 444–468). Moreover, this pairing (*Event d(c)1* - *Event a + b*) is repeated in strophe V (Table 4.1, II, 79). In facing the difficulty of finishing the movement after an ‘unfinished’ episode—*Event d(c)2*, interrupted by the hybrid section *Scherzo Event a + Scherzo Event b* (bars 478–491)—something similar to the Ninth Symphony happens, according to Micznik’s analysis (2001, p. 238). As in the development of the first movement of that Symphony, there is also an inversion of events, compared to the first appearance, as a marker that the story is not yet finished.

Here, however, the position of this inversion of events is more problematic than in the first movement of the Ninth Symphony, since it occurs in the coda instead of within the development. The listener expects a denouement after those sections, *Event d(c)1–2*, but Mahler eludes this expectation. In fact, because of their strongest gestural differentiation

and their character of anagnorisis, and the unveiling of the fullest of *Group III motive* in the movement, *Event d(c)1–2* can be considered climaxes of the narrative plot of the movement. This denouement does not happen, however, because both sections are suddenly interrupted by *Scherzo Event* sections at bars 444 and 492. The search for the ‘right’ order of events has a dramatic effect on the final peroration of the hybrid last section (bars 503–522), where the right order, *Scherzo Event a + Scherzo Event b + Trio Event c*, seems a hasty manifestation of an artificial triumphalism that eludes the denouement invoked by *Event d(c)1* and 2.

To sum up, although the OD of the second movement has a lower degree of narrativity than the first movement, on paradigmatic and syntagmatic planes it definitely shows aspects of narrative disruption of conventional scherzo form. Now it remains to establish, in the following sections 3–5, how the diachronic compositional pathway has led to this outcome, considering the large amount of the movement’s available preparatory materials.

### 3. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 1–245

Comparison at the ‘story’ level of the movement’s changes during the compositional process shows clear evidence of a process of *narrativisation* of the movement’s basic events by means of an increasing morpho-syntactic and semantic individualisation. Consequently, at the last stage of the compositional process these events become comparable to those of narrative. This is apparent at the beginning of the movement. On the one hand, there is a certain interchangeability of the scherzo’s internal sections. According to the chronology of pages (Table 2.6 II, 7–8), bars 27–40 in II-DSS2, which are almost identical to bars 3–16 of II-DSS3 and II-DSS5 (Ex. 4.8, II, 80, squares 1, 2 and 3), were conceived early on as a new beginning of the movement, and later as the continuation of II-DSS3, as an insert between II-DSS3 and II-DSS4. But on the other hand, within the three attempts at the incipit,



an increasing ‘diseconomy of materials’<sup>85</sup> conflicts with the above highlighted modular interchangeability. A motive of *Group I*, absent on II-DSS2, is added at bars 1–6 on II-DSS3 (Ex. 4.8, II, 80, square 4) and on II-DSS5 at bars 27–28 and 43–44 (Ex. 4.8, II, 82, in the square). Moreover, this motive is added on this same page II-DSS5 at bars 60–61 as an insert in the upper stave (indicated in the square Ex. 4.8, II, 84; the word ‘*Einschub*’ ‘insertion’, has been added by the transcriber, Bouwman).

Again, it is especially important to note that *Group III motive* is added on II-DSS3 at bars 17–19 and 21 when it was absent in the corresponding bars 41–42, 44 (45) of II-DSS2 (Ex. 4.8, II, 81 square 5). In these bars of II-DSS3, this motive is indistinguishable autonomously, given that it is tangled in a polyphonic and polyrhythmic fabric. Certainly from this aspect it is possible to detect an increase in one of the attributes of a high degree of narrativity, according to Gerald Prince (1982, p. 145): narrative coexistence of different time sequences. It is possible that at this moment of adding *Group III motive* Mahler may have prefigured its narrative ‘actantial’ (to use Almén’s term) role in the movement’s continuation. The textural entanglement of this motive in these pages, then, could have been conceived as a starting point of its gradual process of acquiring agential autonomy.

Concerning *Trio Event c1*, there is a further step in the construction of the agential autonomy of this occurrence of *Group III motive*. In fact, Mahler, having written II-DSS10, added an occurrence of this motive at bars 192–193 on II-DSS11 (Ex. 4.13, II, 91, in the square), a page that is a rewriting of bars 165–177 and 196–224 of II-DSS10 (Ex. 4.12, II, 89–90). Finally, on the following page II-DSS12, when Mahler completed the restatement of *Trio Event*, he put in the final position of the OD the ‘hurdy-gurdy’ bars 196–197 (see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman 2, 50) already created on II-DSS10 (Ex. 4.12, II, 89,

---

<sup>85</sup> For the meaning of this phrase see p. 110, footnote 65.

square 1). Moreover, on the same page II-DSS12, he completed them with the other ‘hurdy-gurdy’ bars 198–201, likewise previously conceived on II-DSS10 (Ex. 4.12, II, 89, square 2). As a result of this new discursive order, writing in that position between the two ‘hurdy-gurdy’ sections, as confirmed in the OD, Mahler probably wanted to draw the listener’s attention to *Group III motive*.

The absence of *Group III motive* between the ‘hurdy-gurdy’ episodes in the restatement of *Trio Event c1* (bars 235–245) on II-DSS10, II-DSS13 and in the OD is significant. In this way, the listener waits in vain for this idea during the restatement of this event. With this device, Mahler probably wanted to trigger the listener’s aptitude, identified by narratologist Paul Ricoeur (1986, pp. 102–103), to ‘follow the story’ of this temporarily lost idea during the movement. Would Mahler have returned, in the OD, to complete a micro-formal symmetry, followed at a macro-formal level with the restatement of *Trio Event c1*?

The answer, of course, is a matter of speculation. On the one hand, this lack could be due merely to an OD that needs to be refined, given its frequent points of fragmentary or inconsistent orchestration. But on the other hand, the presence of clues of the above plot of the movement in different parameters suggests that this incompleteness is structural. In other words, it seems that Mahler wanted to ‘background’ the expected occurrence of *Group III motive* to highlight its gestural emancipation in *Event d(c)1* later in the movement. Once again, the ‘narrative’ of the compositional process can reveal Mahler’s strategy, only partially visible in the final version (or in the last stage of existing material), and can orient the hermeneutic of the (unfinished) text and even a strategy of listening.

From the point of view of the dimension of semantics, another suggestion of ‘narrativisation’ is evident from the fact that, given the progressive addition during the compositional process, in this section the number of intertextual semantic references

increases. From this perspective, another irregular rhythm, on II-DSS3 (Ex. 4.8, II, 80, squares 1 and 4)—on its own irregular and belonging to *Group I*—is superimposed onto the already irregular rhythm of II-DSS2. The modularity and the irregular geometry of *Group II* motives, with the help of a motive of *Group I*, become ‘prismatic’ in their rhythmic multidimensionality, acquiring a semantic depth. In this way, note also that in the rewriting of II-DSS6 in II-DSS8 (Ex. 4.10, II, 87, bars 152, 155, 156, 157, in the squares), Mahler added countermelodies with motives taken from *Group II*. In the OD, trills are added at bar 191, mordents at bar 188 and bar 237 on II-DSS13, and countermelodies containing further chromaticism in the violin at bars 233–239. These are all features that seek to emulate the unstable temperament of the hurdy-gurdy’s strings.

Also at a level of the movement’s ‘discourse’, it is evident that Mahler increased the degree of discursive narrativity of the early musical ideas. This is achieved by significant discursive changes during the compositional process, in Micznik’s dimensions of gestural connotations and the duration of events. Concerning gestural connotations, the replacement of nexuses determined by tonal conventions with Subotnik’s discursive ‘analogous structures’ is revealed by the opposite gestural strategy for *Scherzo Event 1* (bars 1–164) and *Trio Event c1* (bars 165–245). For *Scherzo Event 1*, page by page, Mahler, as above, makes the musical fabric more irregular, especially rhythmically. For *Trio Event c1*, however, there is an opposite pathway of making the morphology of the section more isochronic and regular, especially rhythmically, and the phrasing more symmetrical. On II-DSS10, the ‘hurdy-gurdy’ bars 185–190 are situated after bar 178 (Ex. 4.12, II, 89, squares 1 and 2) so that the Ländler cannot be so fluent as happens in the OD from bars 179–184. Bars 168–173 of II-DSS12 (see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman 2, 2017, p. 48) present an isochronic regular metre—the Ländler ‘triple-time’ accompaniment formula—that is absent on II-DSS10 and II-DSS11 and contrasts with the irregular one of *Scherzo Event 1*.

The subsequent compositional process of the movement suggests that at the moment of writing *Trio Event c1*, Mahler could have had in mind the suspensive change of writing of *Event d(c)1–2*. At that moment, then, he was building a gesture, a regular dance, which has a degree of gestural (and temporal) separation from *Scherzo Event* (which is also a dance, if rhythmically irregular). But also, *Trio Event c1* has another degree of gestural separation from the quasi-atemporal suspension of *Event d(c)1–2*. Thus, this compositional plan seems to evolve just around the backbone of the occurrences of *Group III motive*, from which *Event d(c)1–2* mainly comes.

About the dimension of the duration of events in *Scherzo Event 1*, the insertion of II-DSS5 (Ex. 4.8, II, 80–84) between II-DSS3 and II-DSS4 creates a significant increase in duration of the longest occurrence of this event. According to Coburn's chronology (2002, p. 173), this page was used as an insert to enlarge *Scherzo Event a* section (bars 1–75) and balance *Scherzo Event b* section (bars 76–125), both already conceived on II-DSS3 and II-DSS4. But from the perspective of the gestural plot I have identified, this long duration of *Scherzo Event 1* in this first part of the movement contrasts with the kaleidoscopic fragmentation in the second part (from *Event d(c)* sections onward).

#### 4. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 246–415

At a ‘story’ level, during the evolution of the compositional process, a process of narrativisation of these bars is detectable morphologically. This consists of a progressive adding of motives from previously unused motive groups, especially in the genesis of *Scherzo Event 2* (bars 246–299) and *Trio Event c2* (bars 300–365) —see Table 4.1, II, 77–79. Concerning the conception of *Scherzo Event 2*, this is clear when considering the profound and numerous rewritings, connected with tonal changes, on II-DSS17 and II-

DSS18. If in the earlier pages (II-DSS10, II-DSS14, II-DSS15) this section is constantly in F sharp major/minor, the entanglement of II-DSS17 (Ex. 4.15, II, 93) testifies to Mahler's difficulty in adapting the newly devised tonal plan of this and the two following sections (*Trio Event c2* and *Scherzo Event 3*). In fact, as noticed by Coburn, in this section on this page Mahler conceives a modulation to E flat major at bar 253, 'as part of [his] substantial expansion of the section, including a return to F sharp' (Coburn, 2002, p. 181) to prepare for the new key of D in the trio. Moreover, three insertions are markers of a narrative 'diseconomy of materials': the first one adds bars 256–258; the second adds bars 259–261 (indicated by the transcriber in Ex. 4.15, II, 93 with '1. *Einschub für i*'—'1. insert for i'—and '2. *Einschub für i*'—'2. insert for i'— respectively); and the third adds bars 261–263 (indicated within the brace in Ex. 4.15, II, 93).<sup>86</sup>

These insertions suggest not only a process of enlargement in connection with tonal changes during the compositional process in the following two sections (*Trio Event c2*, *Scherzo Event 3*), as suggested by Coburn (2002, pp. 168, 180–181), but also, from my perspective, a progressive increasing of motives and 'motivic hybridity'. On II-DSS17, three insertions—those indicated in Ex. 4.15, II, 93 as 'Einschub für I' and 'Einschub für II', and that of bars 261–263 (indicated within the brace in Ex. 4.15, II, 93)—present *Group I* motives that are added to those belonging to *Group II*, which this page inherits from the previous pages. These three insertions contain *Scherzo Event b*'s motivic material that is juxtaposed for 'hybridity' with that of *Scherzo Event a*, inherited from earlier pages. Mahler's intention to increase the motivic material is also suggested by his decision to drop, on II-DSS18, bars of II-DSS17 (Ex. 4.15, II, 93, square 1), which seem to continue the 'discourse', based mainly on *Group II* motives, of *Scherzo Event 2* on II-DSS14–II-DSS15.

---

<sup>86</sup> See the insertion mark on II-DSS15.

To increase this ‘diseconomy of materials’ in *Scherzo Event 2*, on page II-DSS17 *Group III motive* is added at bars 266–268 (Ex. 4.15, II, 93, square 2) after bar 253. Likewise, there is a ‘diseconomy of materials’ also in the conception of *Trio Event c2* (bars 300–365): the insertion on II-DSS19 of *Group III motive*, bars 320–330 in C major (Ex. 4.17, II, 95, in the square), which were absent in the previous versions of II-DSS14 and II-DSS15.

The genesis of *Scherzo Event 2* and *Scherzo Event 3* also reveals Mahler's strategy of rhythmic enrichment. This process implies an increasing of Prince's narrative coexistence of several conflicting time sequences. If on II-DSS14 (Ex. 4.14, II, 92), then, every bar of *Scherzo Event 2* is regular, with three beats in each bar, on II-DSS15, II-DSS18 (Ex. 4.16, II, 94) and II-DSS17 (Ex. 4.15, II, 93) some of these *Scherzo Event* bars are rewritten in quadruple time. This happens by moving the note of the anacrusis of a bar into the next bar (in II-DSS15, bar 246, see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman 2, 2017, p. 53), or by prolonging the duration of the first note of bars 247 and 249 on II-DSS15, in bars 249 b, 252 on II-DSS17 (Ex. 4.15, II, 93, in the circles) and bars 249 b, 252 on II-DSS18 (Ex. 4.16, II, 94, bars 249 b, 252). This process is made more complex on II-DSS17 and II-DSS18 by adding one of *Group I* motives, which conflict rhythmically with those of *Group II*. Similarly, the first conception of *Scherzo Event 3* on II-DSS16 (see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman, 2, 2017, p. 62) has a regular 3/4, and the second version of this event on II-DSS21 and II-DSS22 is metrically irregular, as in the OD (see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman, 1, 2017, pp. 62\*–63\*). Semantically, this kind of rhythmicisation in *Scherzo Event 2* and *Scherzo Event 3* is what gives them the character of an ‘unruly’ dance, the increasing heterogeneity of material making it more ‘feverish’.

At a ‘discourse’ level, the strategy Mahler employs also suggests a process of narrativisation during the composition, through changes involving the discursive parameter

of gestural connotations. In fact, across the two versions of the DSS, there is an evolution of a simpler, tonally static plot. As shown in Table 2.8, II, 10, the first version presents a more linear tonal plot: F sharp minor/major in *Scherzo Event 2*; G flat major (enharmonically: F sharp major) in *Trio Event c2*; and F sharp minor/major in *Scherzo Event 3*. According to Coburn (2002, p. 166), in the second version Mahler decided to distance the keys of *Trio Event c2* and *Scherzo Event 3* from the tonal centre of F sharp major by rewriting them in the keys of D major and F major, respectively. This choice corresponds to a more complex tonal pathway and a gestural strategy of enlarging these sections and increasing the diseconomy of materials so that the musical discourse in *Scherzo Event 2* and *Scherzo Event 3* is made more feverish and concentrated, becoming more ‘developmental’.

Coburn (2002, p. 169) explains the choice of the new keys for *Trio Event c2* and *Scherzo Event 3* in purely musical terms by invoking considerations concerning the tonal relationship between the first and second movements. I do not exclude this as one reason for this choice, given the deeply cyclic nature of the Symphony. However, I suspect that it could have been coordinated with, or even subordinated to, Micznik’s (2001, p. 196) ‘other domain of reality’,<sup>87</sup> set outside of music. In fact, the agreement of elements of different parameters suggests that the reason can be found in the above-described gestural plot culminating with sections *Event d(c)1–2*, which breaks the more feverish and sharp-cornered *Weltlauf* of the scherzo. From this perspective, the harmonic pathway originating from a more distant starting point (*Trio Event c2* in D major) until the end of the movement (Table 4.1, II, 79) can be a ‘narrative’ which is more effective and engaging for the listener.

A further, and perhaps more decisive, support for my view of Mahler’s strategy is evidenced in the insertions throughout the compositional process of the two occurrences of

---

<sup>87</sup> See Chapter One, section 1, p. 10.

*Group III motive* in this section. With these two occurrences Mahler seems to want to extract from the depth of his creative process the final part of a pathway of gradual resurfacing to the memory (via *Trio Event*) in the ‘present tense’ of the *Weltlauf/Scherzo Event* before the strong gestural change of *Event d(c)1*. In this view, it seems significant that the more fluent occurrence of *Group III motive* of bars 320–330 (Ex. 4.17, II, 95, in the square) happens at two levels immanent in the OD and in that of the ‘narrative’ resulting from the compositional process by the different tonal plans for *Trio Event c2* and *Scherzo Event 2*. For precisely this purpose, Mahler has probably made *Scherzo Event 2* and *Scherzo Event 3* more developmental, to increase their contrast with the ‘timeless’ *Event d(c)1–2* (bars 416–443 and 469–477, Exs. 4.5, II, 74 and 4.6, II, 75).

## 5. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 416–522 (Coda)

At Micznik’s ‘story’ level, in this section during the compositional process Mahler increases the gestural autonomy of the basic ideas, the number of motive groups employed in the melodic–thematic construction, and the motivic hybridity. Once again, these aspects increase the degree of narrativity during the compositional process. From this perspective, a key role is played again by *Group III motive*. In fact, for the first occurrence of *Event d(c)1* (bars 416–442), page II-DSS24 adds a motive, absent on the previous page II-DSS2 (Ex. 4.18, II, 96), of *Group III* at bars 417 and at bars 421–422 (Exs. 4.18; 4.19, square 1; II, 96). On the same page II-DSS24, these bars are linked with bars 422–430 (Ex. 4.19, II, 96, square 2), inherited by this page from II-DSS23. In this way, this section, which also contains motives from *Group I* characterising *Scherzo Event*, becomes more ascribable to *Group III motive* and acquires semantic autonomy. In addition, the long-lasting melody resulting from this additive compositional process appears as a continuation and completion of the previous transient occurrences during the movement of this *Group III motive*.



Another marker of progressive gestural autonomy across versions of *Event d(c)I* at bars 416–22 can be found on II-DSS24 and in the OD, where Mahler improves the gestural definition of the pedal. In fact, this passage in the previous page II-DSS23 (Ex. 4.18, II, 96) already has long durations in the bass, but without that more precise gestural definition of the pedal at bars 416–422, with ties in the OD (Ex. 4.20, II, 97, square 1). Instead, a marker of an increasing motivic hybridity across versions is detectable in the *Scherzo Event* occurrence in bars 444–468. A motive from *Group III* is added here as an *Einlage* into II-DSS23, at bars 452–454 and at bars 467–468 of the OD (Exs. 4.23 and 4.24, II, 100–101, in the squares). From the point of view of semantics, the pedal added in *Event d(c)I* at bars 416–22 on II-DSS24 (Ex. 4.19, II, 96) and in the OD (Ex. 4.20, II, 97, square 2) needs to be mentioned. This additive version distinguishes the section semantically in terms I have labelled ‘enchantment’ by its striking contrast with the feverish adjacent sections. Similarly, the caricatured tone in the final peroration at bars 503–522 is acquired by this passage only in the OD by the addition of brass chords.

If we turn our attention to Micznik’s ‘discourse’ level, the analysis of preparatory materials allows us to infer some details about Mahler’s strategy of narrativisation concerning the narrative plot and analytic parameters of gestural connotations and order of events. For what concerns gestural connotations, the changes between II-DSS23 (Ex. 4.18, II, 96), II-DSS24 (Ex. 4.19, II, 96, square 1) and OD (Ex. 4.20, II, 97, square 1) present two genetic pieces of evidence involved in this perspective. First, in the OD, after the uncertain and often short occurrences of motives from *Group III* up to that point, a new event, *Event d(c)I* (I have labelled it as ‘enchantment’), occurs in another very different gestural environment. In regards to this occurrence, during the compositional process the additions of *Group III motive* at bars 417–419, 422–423 and the conception of a pedal at bars 417–421 on II-DSS24 (Ex. 4.19, II, 96) and the OD (Ex. 4.20, II, 97), respectively, are

remarkable. Then on II-DSS24 (Ex. 4.19, II, 96) and in the OD (Ex. 4.20, II, 97), *Group III motive* is linked without a break of continuity with *Trio Event c* material (*Group IV*) at bars 422–430, inherited by II-DSS23 (Ex. 4.18, II, 96), in an uninterrupted melody (scored in OD with a same instrument, Violin I, bars 422–430) —see II, 96, Ex. 4.18, in the square; Ex. 4.19, squares 1 and 2 and Ex 4.20, II, 97, squares 1 and 2. These features indicate the composer’s effort to emancipate that motive from its previous occurrences’ non-autonomous condition, also given by their shortness, by its reoccurring during the section and the long duration of the pedal. This ‘effort to recall’, which is evident in this search for continuity for *Group III motive*, is more successful and continuous in *Event d(c)2* (bars 469–490). Here *Group III motive* fully unfolds its continuity. Ever since its first conception on II-DSS22, this second occurrence of *Event d(c)* has an uninterrupted melodic gesture entirely ascribable to this *Group III motive*.

The second piece of evidence involved in Mahler’s narrative strategy is that the ‘retrospective’ character of ‘emerging to the memory’ of these two episodes, which is evident in the OD, seems an expression of the ‘genetic story’ of *Event d(c)1*. In fact, this section was composed retrospectively in the insertions of II-DSS22 and II-DSS23 (see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, pp. 66–69) and II-DSS24 (see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman, 2017, 2, pp. 66–69).

The dimension of the order of events provides us with another support for identifying and detailing the construction of this plot during the compositional process. From this point of view, it is evident that without the above insertion of pages II-DSS23 and II-DSS24 there would be no reversal of form already identified by Coburn (2002, p. 185) and mentioned earlier (p. 135). In explaining this reversal, Coburn again invokes reasons of symmetry of tonal areas within the movement and the entire Symphony. Instead, this reversal seems to

be triggered by the above-mentioned narrative plot during the compositional process. In other words, the eluded denouement (mentioned on p. 138) of this formal reversal seems to be a representation in the OD of the compositional process of this movement's coda. More specifically, this formal reversal appears as an effect of formal destabilisation determined by the process of a progressive unfolding of memory in the compositional process.

## 6. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the Second Movement

Scherzo I has the appearance of being the Symphony's least narrative movement, given that it seems more clear-cut and has a more traditional (dance-like) form than the others. Like the third movement, this one also lacks the huge morphological disruptiveness of the other movements. Unlike the third, however, it also lacks verbal written references (contained in the movement's manuscript or letters and testimonies) that can be interpreted as supporting textual clues of some narrativising purpose of Mahler's. But more specifically, in contrast to the other Scherzo movement in the Tenth Symphony (the fourth movement), this one lacks musical events that can be assimilated into Barthesian catalysers. By that, I mean the narrative resources whose addition during the compositional process affirm Mahler's 'narrativising' initial sketches and drafts.

In this movement, however, Mahler innovates greatly but subtly in a narrative sense. He undertakes a polyrhythmic taking apart of the metrical, dance-like regularity of the traditional scherzo form scheme. This aspect suggests that the narrative aspects presented up to now in this chapter belong to a more global narrative ploy of Mahler's. This strategy could in fact be an Ecovian 'intention of text', denoting a unitary and teleological narrative purpose inferable at synchronic (the last compositional draft) and diachronic (compositional process) levels, in this apparently traditional, clear-cut, dance-like movement.

To confirm this suspicion, as in the first movement we need to answer two key questions:

a) In what sense is Genette's (1980/1983, p. 28) 'narrative action' detectable? In other words, if narrative implies someone who is telling something, who 'narrates' in the movement, and from what diegetic or extradiegetic level(s)? And can he or she be compared to a character at some diegetic or extradiegetic level(s)?

b) What does Mahler mean by this narrative modification of traditional formal and morpho-syntactic nexuses? Or, in the terms I used in Chapter One, what might Mahler's communicative intention behind the process of narrativisation be?

Answering these questions is more difficult here than for other movements, because of conventional formal aspects of this movement, which seem to reduce the degree of narrativity. Given these difficulties, then, I will prepare the field by making preliminary observations on the movement's 'analogous structure' which I see as a 'gradual resurfacing and suppression of the past'. The semantic backbone of this plot is a pathway of musical temporal representation. It starts from the present time of *Weltlauf* (in *Scherzo Events* 1, 2 and 3), then leads to the flashback of the nostalgic tone (in *Trio Event c*, sections 1–2), then to the further temporal step back of the childlike kaleidoscope of *Event d(c)1–2* and then the Freudian suppressive return of *Scherzo Event/Weltlauf* in the coda. The study of the compositional process has provided strong support for this reading. In fact, during the compositional process, Mahler has increased the distance between these sections gesturally and even tonally. So in the construction of this plot, the teleology of the *Group III motive* becomes important at the level of the OD—with the occurrences of this motive (bars 17–19, 192–193, 266–267, 320–330) up to the sections *Event d(c)1–2*—and at the level of the

compositional process of these passages.

The ever longer and autonomous occurrences of *Group III motive* gradually emancipate this musical idea, in a thematic sense, until *Event d(c)1–2*, in which this motive dominates and acquires a full morpho-syntactic and semantic autonomy. As in the first movement, I can read this pathway as a stylised compositional *process* of *Event d(c)1–2* within the *product* of the last compositional stage. To explain how I reached this conclusion, I refer to the article by Kinderman, on which I commented on p. 35. In explaining the nature of quotations of the Lied ‘Ich bin der Welt abhanden gekommen’ in the last movement of the Fifth Symphony, Kinderman borrows Darcy’s notion of ‘rotational form’ (2001). This theory speaks of ‘successive rotations [which] become a sort of generative matrix within which this telos is engendered, processed, nurtured, and brought to full presence’ (Kinderman, 2006, p. 252). So, the pathway of emancipation of *Group III motive* can be considered a ‘teleological genesis’ in which occurrences are made progressively more ‘revelatory’ because they are always longer. To enlarge Kinderman’s analytical view, I add that this ‘teleological genesis’ is clearly connected to the aforementioned stylised process of writing. Thus, occurrences of *Group III motive* (bars 17–19, 192–193, 266–267, 320–330)—which are musical ‘enclaves’ within the *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c* sections—seem to be ‘sketches’, and *Event d(c)1–2* their more polished and teleologically more ‘complete’, ‘final version’.

Again, I notice that at a synchronic level of the last compositional stage, this ‘teleological genesis’ is additive. This aspect is due to two reasons. First, the sequence of *Group III motive* occurrences presents a progressive adding of bars. Second, the final ‘product’ of this ‘process’, the suspensive and ‘childlike’ *Event d(c)1–2*, is an addition to the traditional scherzo form, having two (not three) alternating sections. Surprisingly, looking at the movement’s sketches and drafts, the compositional process of these occurrences of *Group*

*III motive* is also additive. In fact, as shown in sections 3–5, none of these occurrences are conceived on the earliest page but simply as afterthoughts in later pages. Even the entire section *Event d(c)I* itself is conceived of as an ‘*Einlage*’ on page II-DSS23.

This additive conception has already happened in the ‘genetic’ evolution of some passages of the first movement, and here also the conception of the occurrences of *Group III motive* is a later result of a difficult additive compositional process. The additive ‘teleological genesis’ of *Event d(c)I–2* might be intended as a representation of a difficult or painful act of memory in music, as happened for some passages in the first movement. Similar to that movement, then, Mahler here seems to represent the (difficult) act of writing of some musical passages meta-referentially in music. So, Mahler artfully disseminated in the OD these additive ‘sketches’ (occurrences of *Group III motive*), then completed in *Event d(c)I–2* an analogy with the additive genesis of this motive in the compositional process. It is interesting to note that the ‘completion’ of those ‘sketches’ in sections *Event d(c)I–2* (bars 416–443 and 469–477) in the last compositional stage draft seems artfully ‘incomplete’. In other words, these sections do not ‘finish but simply [terminate]’ (to use White’s phrase, 1980, p. 9). They are interrupted by the sudden restart of trio sections (bars 444–468 and 469–491) which, in support of the above reading, sounds like a Freudian suppression of traumatic memory (*Event d(c)I–2*). As in the first movement, given the music’s weak denotative power, the subjective voice of the Genettian narrator is represented by the ideographic proxy of his stylised act of writing. Considering the narrative evolution during the movement of *Group III motive*, the questions which opened this section can now be answered.

Question a) can be answered by the following points:

- 1) The movement begins in a straightforward manner with an ‘objective’ *Weltlauf*, in the absence of catalysers. Until the first occurrence of *Group III motive*,

the ‘narrator’ does not leave his ‘subjective’ and meta-referential ‘scriptorial’ traces in the text. Something akin to a diegesis is, in any case, recognisable in the alternation of *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c* sections until bar 415. Thus, in the absence of verb tenses in music, it is evident from the ‘genetic’ analysis that Mahler has worked during the compositional process to differentiate gesturally and semantically these events so that they can simulate diegetic temporal excursions. Thus, during the compositional process, Mahler made the *Scherzo Event* sections more polyrhythmic to allude to a present time (*Scherzo Event* sections with their modernist pre-Stravinskian polyrhythmic excitation). In contrast, Mahler makes the *Trio Event c* section more rhythmically regular during the compositional process, to invoke the nostalgia of an earlier time. Also, he distances the keys of *Trio Event c2* and *Scherzo Event 3* from the tonal centre of F sharp major (G flat major)/F sharp minor, by rewriting them in later pages in the keys of D major and F major, respectively. Given the absence of his ‘subjective’ traces in the movement’s sections, it is difficult to identify something similar to a voice or narrator; but if there is one, it is surely a ‘neutral’ extradiegetic–heterodiegetic narrator.

With the occurrences of *Group III motive*, and with *Event d(c)1–2*, the ‘narrator’ leaves his traces in the text through meta-referential references to the difficulty of the ‘additive’ compositional process of those occurrences. In this way, Mahler makes us aware that part of the movement is a ‘subjective’ telling or recalling (but with difficulty) of something older (maybe something concerning a childhood world). So the *writing process* marks the narrator, the protagonist of the story. In Genette’s terms, then, this ‘voice’ is ‘intradiegetic’: it is located exclusively in those bars of *Event d(c)1–2* which refer to *Group III motive*. These, however, are gesturally fused with the other ideas (ascribable to *Groups I, II and IV*), without a break of gestural

continuity (like in the first movement's juxtaposition of *Event x* with *Event B(x)* and *Event y*).

2) The dynamics described in 1) suggest an 'outside' diegetic level and an 'within' diegetic level. In this context, then, the narrator is also 'homodiegetic' because that stylised process of writing makes him a character of the 'story' (within diegetic level) of *Event d(c)1–2*, constructed through that meta-referentially 'scriptorial' process.

3) The interruptive blocks of bars 444–468 and 478–522 (with *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c* sections) seem to be a return to the starting condition. But the caricatural and clumsy horn chords of bars 503–508 (which were absent in the earliest passage's page and added only in the OD) sound like an extradiegetic narrator's intervention, having an 'ideological function', to use Genette's phrase (1980/1982, p. 256). In other words, the narrator seems (with sarcasm) to make the listener aware that the happy ending (with the restoration of the 'right' order of *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event*) is illusory and artificial. This is suggested by the fact that it happens at the expense of *Event d(c)1–2*, suppressed by *Scherzo Event* occurrences, and *Group III motive* presented in bars 452–454, 467–468 (and again conceived as afterthoughts), 492–49 and incorporated into the prevailing *Scherzo Event/Weltlauf*.<sup>88</sup>

I can finally attempt an answer to question b) about the composer's possible communicative intention behind the process of narrativisation in this juxtaposition of quite contrasting narrative planes (the objective, extradiegetic–heterodiegetic telling of the

---

<sup>88</sup> Mahler's intention of disseminating motives of the *Group III Motive* in the *Event Scherzo* section is validated by the further insertion (later discarded) of bar 491 in II-DSS22.



*Weltlauf*, the intermediate degree of *Trio Event c* occurrences, and the intradiegetic–homodiegetic childlike ‘kaleidoscopic’ subjectivity of *Event d(c)1–2*). Once again, the focus must be on the ‘story’ of *Group III motive* and its occurrence-after-occurrence evolution in the OD.

This pathway is an admirable example of an Adornian ‘variant’ (1960/1992, pp. 82–105), and if read in light of the above sequence of narrative planes, it reveals Mahler's ploy with surprising fullness. In this view, the occurrences of *Group III motive*, until *Event d(c)1*, work like a ubiquitous spirit. Conceived in later manuscript pages, they cross the compositional process diachronically, and synchronically in the last compositional stage of *Scherzo Event* and *Trio Event c* sections, in which these occurrences apparently take part but are subtly ‘extraterritorial’. In occurrence after occurrence, this ‘recall machine’ seems uncontrollable once triggered. Mahler ‘buries’ a new occurrence of *Group III motive* —see the absence of this motif between the ‘hurdy-gurdy’ episodes of the restatement of *Trio Event c1* (bars 235–245) on II-DSS10 and II-DSS13. In this way, the listener waits in vain for this idea during the restatement. But this sort of Freudian *suppression* of memory fatally generates the ‘discharge’ of the following longer occurrence of *Group III motive* at bars 320–330, which can have as a consequence *Event d(c) 1–2*, where this this motive acquires its full autonomy.

Once unavoidably opened, the door is soon closed, as with Freudian resistance, by the return of *Weltlauf* of an extradiegetic–heterodiegetic telling. But it is just the world beyond that door that renders the rest of the coda deceptive and false, as revealed by the authorial intervention of the horns at bars 503–508. The hurried conclusion of the movement is a marker that the story of the fight between the objectivity of *Weltlauf* and the meta-referential scriptorial subjectivity, already begun in the first movement, is destined to continue. From this point of view, this movement is less self-sufficient than the others. Its world is

apparently less finished, in need of continuation in the following movement.<sup>89</sup> The movement's uncontrollability, then, and its derivation from a minimal and apparently insignificant detail (*Group III* occurrence of bars 17–19), as it appears in the OD, has a parallel in a Proustian 'involuntary memory', whose celebrated example is the madeleine episode in *À la Recherche du Temps Perdu*. Thus, the following occurrences during the movement of this motive can be read as moments 'in which linear time is interrupted and derailed by the operations of memory', to use Johnson's (2014, p. 90) phrase about the finale of Mahler's First Symphony. Considering all these pieces of evidence, then, the apparently involuntary (or at least uncontrollable) irruptive revoking of *Event d(c) 1–2* seems to be the calculated effect of a composer's deliberate, overall strategy for narrativising, put into action throughout the entire compositional process. The signification that emerges within the movement as a whole is that of involuntary memory. More specifically, the compositional process pursued by Mahler is itself the signifier both of the unstoppable memory and of its suppression.

---

<sup>89</sup> Jan Jongbloed (1991, p. 147) suggests that Mahler conceived this Scherzo after the first and the fourth movements as the Finale of an unusual three-movement symphony – given the title written in the manuscript of the OD, 'II. 2. Scherzo–Finale' – but that he soon changed this idea. Beyond the reliability of this hypothesis, it seems undeniable, based on my argument, that it is the intrinsic musical matter of this movement which requires continuation.

# Chapter Five. Narrativity and Narrativisation in the Third Movement

Following the previous chapters dedicated to the first and second movements, it is now time to apply my three staged analytic apparatus to the Tenth's third movement, entitled 'Purgatorio'. However, here, the task is a little more difficult than in the other movements. This is because very few changes are apparent in either of the last compositional stages, compared with the DSS: an OD (completed only until bar 24) and a completed SS. As a result, my analysis (presented in sections 1 and 2) with my analytical apparatus is based solely on the OD. I will omit the second 'genetic' stage of my apparatus and pass directly to the third stage (in section 3) — the overall narrative interpretation of the movement. This last phase of my apparatus obviously cannot be corroborated by many 'genetic' pieces of evidence. However, it is intended as a theoretical and analytical overview of the process of narrativisation by the few (but significant) changes during the compositional process of the movement. My analysis will reveal that behind its appearance as an unproblematic, easy-going movement, the movement actually manifests a subtle dismantling, in narrative terms, of traditional forms in a complex intertextual and meta-referential play.

## 1. The Analysis of the 'Story' Level

In its first part (bars 1–63), the movement lacks those morpho-syntactic gestural contrasts that indicate articulated and discrete events. In the second part (bars 64–121), however, a narrative sequence of discrete morpho-syntactic and semantically distinguishable events articulates a narrative discourse. To fully understand the difference in narrativity of these

two parts, it is necessary to start with a general observation about the motivic construction of the movement. As in the second movement, the basic motivic materials with which the movement's events are built are short motives that combine in various ways to create these morpho-syntactically and semantically autonomous units. Like the second movement, 'Purgatorio' is characterised by 'motivic hybridity'. In other words, each of the autonomous events of the movement is composed of short basic motivic units which often recur in other events. These small motivic units do not themselves have a semantic autonomy and so cannot be qualified as events, except for motives I label with '*IV/2-6*' (presented in Ex. 5.1, II, 104) in the second part of the movement.

According to Rothkamm (2003, pp. 143–145),<sup>90</sup> these small basic units can be grouped paradigmatically into four motive groups he labels with the Roman numbers '*I-IV*' (see again Ex. 5.1, II, 103–104, which presents the most important cells and motives of the movement).<sup>91</sup> To these basic elements I add a *perpetuum mobile* (Ex. 5.2, II, 105). This is an accompaniment pattern which is not varied and developed during the movement but which deserves to be included within the basic materials because of its structural role in the movement's morphology and semantics.

The first part of the movement lacks discrete, morpho-syntactically and semantically individualised musical ideas. I observe, however, that in the melodic–harmonic construction of this first part are significant points of breaking and disarticulation of a song-like metrical regularity that seems to characterise the movement. All of these aspects can be associated with Micznik's 'disruptive' markers of narrativity, despite the absence of discrete events. With this viewpoint, as shown by Rothkamm (2003, p. 148), the vocal nature of the

---

<sup>90</sup> See footnote 50 in Chapter One, p. 76, for a brief description of Rothkamm's motivic inventory and its theoretical place in my analytical apparatus.

<sup>91</sup> In each of the labels I borrow from Rothkamm the Arab numeral indicates the single occurrences (listed in Ex.1, II, 103–104) of these groups.

movement induces Mahler to build its structure in terms of quite regular sequences of conventional eight-bar periods, in couplets whose second line is a variation of the first. As pointed out by Rothkamm (2003, p. 146), each period is divisible into four-bar phrases with rests (with the single exception of the five-bar period in bars 36–41). Also, these four-bar phrases and even cells are often separated by rests, to make the segmentation of these short musical ideas clear to the listener. From another perspective, however, this schematic and easily recognisable regularity is unbalanced by some motives, which Coburn (2002, p. 190) defines as ‘refrains’, belonging to motive group *I*. These refrains are added to fill the metric gaps between periods, within and outside the symmetrical 8+8 bar scheme (Table 5.1, II, 106). A look at the position in Table 5.1 of these refrains (henceforth ‘external’, because they are placed *outside* those periods) allows us to see their irregular distribution (after the couplets and between the period couplet). In disarticulating the song-like regular phraseological pattern, these refrains assume at bars 33 and 49 the role of interrupting longer motives *I, 9*, presented at bars 29 and 48, respectively.

Within these periods, motives belonging to group *I* and very similar to the ‘external refrain’ assume an additional role of refrains (henceforth, ‘internal’, because they are placed *inside* each period), *interrupting* longer musical ideas of motive groups *I, II* or *III*. As Rothkamm shows (2003, pp. 148–149), in the first two periods there is always a continuous pairing of motives of group *I* and group *II*. From bar 25 onwards, motives belonging to motive group *III* are added to this still prevalent pairing. In addition, Rothkamm (2003, p. 146) points out that in the first period the difference in length between motives of motive group *I* and those of motive group *II* is balanced by pauses. I argue, then, that a regular, symmetrical 4+4 pattern is achieved with irregular, asymmetrical and discontinuous elements—because they are interrupted by rests and also because of the asymmetry between them.

Within this discontinuity, evidenced by rests and metrical irregularities, at a micro-formal level there is a detachment from an ideal model of an easy-going ‘complete’ Lied form (‘complete’ in the sense of ‘not interrupted’) and of a consequent strophic regularity. In the movement, however, this is pursued at a more global level in the symmetry of the period couplets. After some initial periods, a better melodic–rhythmic continuity is reached only with the couplet of periods *c* (42–49) and *c'* (53–59)—Table 5.1, II, 106. Here the ‘interrupting’ obsessive motives *I*, *2 + I*, *3* of group I, previously present at bars 23 and 33, are absent. In a more continuous, song-like gesture, a juxtaposition of the two respective sub-phrases (bars 44–48 and 55–58) finishes with two intervals that are ascending and descending, respectively, in a typical marker of folk vocal music. Compared to the previous and following periods, a greater symmetry is evident also from two ‘complementary’ groups of four semiquavers at bars 44 and 46, respectively, with the latter as the inverse of the former (Ex. 5.3, II, 107, in the square). As indicated in Table 5.1, II, 106, this last period *c'* is preceded in bars 51–52 by motive *III/3*, situated after the refrain and likewise outside the metric 8+8 scheme. Coburn (2002, p. 195) defines this motive as a ‘false repetition’ of motive *III/3* at bar 42, but I believe I can define it more properly as a clumsy ‘false starting’ of the period *c'*, given the subsequent repetition of the same motive at bar 53. As I will show later, it is remarkable that in the ‘narrative’ of the movement this ‘false starting’ makes the character of the period *c'* grotesque and clumsy, at a semantic level.

According to Rothkamm (2003, p. 150), in bars 42–63 not only is the melodic system of the phrases mostly periodic, but the harmony is, too; however, this balance is significantly broken up in some key passages. Coburn notices, for example, that

Mahler articulated the first double phrase, therefore, as a point of continuation rather than as a full cadence, [...] [Instead the section in bars 42–63] sounds like an interruption because the

tonal resolution [at bar 41] of this refrain is a measure earlier than the agogic resolution [at bar 42] (Coburn (2002, pp. 194–195).

Another crucial morpho-syntactic point is an enigmatic double cadence at the end of section A. Coburn (2002, p. 190) avers that ‘this cadence [bar 63] is extended into another, stronger cadence in F minor [at bars 63–64]. The continual resolutions of the refrain on B flat [minor] throughout the section, however, weakens the strength of F minor as the tonic triad at this point [bar 63]’. I add that the modulation from the key of F minor to the key of D minor is patently and clumsily ‘forced’ through a chromatic slippage (Ex. 5.4, II, 108, in the square).

In the second part, section B (bars 63–121), the disruptive play of the disarticulation of the song and its dance-like regularity is even more evident, and the contrasts are stronger and more numerous than in the first part. As in section A, the destabilising power of motives belonging to group *I* continues within the strophic scheme of section B in their function of ‘internal’ refrain (Table 5.2, II, 108). But three aspects increase the narrative disruptiveness of this section B. These are all connected with the motive group *IV*, to which are added motives belonging to motive groups *I*, *II* and *III*. First, the occurrence of a motive of group *IV* at bar 84 corresponds with a reduction of a regular strophic pattern that characterises section A, so that the binary model loses its way. As per Table 5.2, II, 108, after the two pairs, periods d–d’ (bars 66–73 and 74–81) and e–e’ (bars 84–91 and 92–100), period f (bars 101–106) stands alone. Then the section at bars 107–121 is divided into period g (bars 107–115) and period h (bars 116–121)—which are 9 (3+3+3) bars + 6 (1+5) bars, instead of 8 (4+4) bars + 8 (4+4) bars, according to the dominant binary scheme (Table 5.2, II, 108). Second, Rothkamm (2003, pp. 145–146) considers the occurrences of the motive group *IV* at bars 84–88, 92–95, 107–108, 113–114 to be quotations of Alma’s ‘Erntelied’, and they

bear the greatest gestural contrast of the movement.<sup>92</sup> Coburn (2002, p. 197) defines them in terms of ‘climactic passages’, considering implicitly the participation of secondary parameters in their physiognomy.

As in other examples from Mahler’s music (the second movement of the Fifth Symphony), climactic breakthroughs also imply some interruption. So here, group *IV* motives through their climactic gestures interrupt the sections of *B* which are ascribable to the dance movement of *A* (bars 64–83, 89–90, 97–106, 109–112). They are stronger interruptions than those of ‘internal’ and ‘external’ refrains, considering the gestural change these group *IV* motives induce. The third aspect which increases the narrative disruptiveness of the section is the occurrence at bars 89–90 of a motive belonging to group *IV* that interrupts the most regular element of section *A*, the *perpetuum mobile* (Ex. 5.2, II, 105), at bars 86–88. In fact, this proceeds continuously, with a few variations of pattern, from the beginning of the movement until bar 62. In section *B*, however, the morphology of this *perpetuum mobile* needs a more careful philological reading, because in this section of the manuscript of the DSS this formula is probably often written in shorthand. In these cases (for example, bars 91–93), where Mahler indicated the harmony only with minim or crotchet chords, Cooke’s performing edition (1976, 1989) realises those chords by writing a complete accompaniment formula. However, in the performing version this criterion is not always followed with the necessary consistency. In fact, it is reasonable to think that in bars 100–104 Mahler also notated in shorthand the formula that he would have developed in the OD in these same bars, given the resemblance of the chords in those bars to those of bars 91–93. In any case, there is no doubt that this *perpetuum mobile* is interrupted at some points of section *B*. In bars 68–72, at the occurrence of motive *IV/1*, the sequences of semiquavers are

---

<sup>92</sup> Alma wrote ‘Erntelied’ (‘Harvest Song’), from *Vier Lieder*, on a text by Ludwig Heinrich Christoph Hölty (1748–1776). The poetry speaks of the awakening of the poet and of a luxuriant and prosperous nature.



interrupted at bars 69, 73 and 77, and there is no evidence of a shorthand writing of the accompaniment formula. This also happens when Mahler writes slurred and tied accompaniment chords (which evidently cannot be intended as arpeggios written shorthand; Ex. 5.5, II, 109, squares 1 and 2). These occur from bars 105–108 and bars 109–112, when they accompany a motive (bars 109–112) which is ascribable to group *I* and previously accompanied by that formula.

To sum up, morpho-syntactically the first part of the movement is gesturally cohesive, though it is subtly disrupted by internal breakings of metrical regularity. In the second part, however, the ‘climactic’ motive *IV* occurrences (bars 84–88, 92–95, 107–108, 113–114) are the bearers of gestural changes and disarticulation of the dance-like regularity of the musical structure. Given the gestural contrast of these occurrences of motive group *IV* and their semantic autonomy and discreteness they can be considered different presentations of what I label ‘*Erntelied Event*’. Also, the dance-like perpetuum mobile sections of the second part (bars 64–83 89–90, 97–106, 109–112), interrupted by the *Erntelied Event*, have a semantic autonomy and discreteness. For these reasons, I consider them occurrences of what I label ‘*Event i*’. Finally, another event is the morpho-semantically autonomous ideas I call ‘*Event k*’, with its only occurrence at bars 168–170 (see below, to identify the semantic autonomy of this event). Considering the pieces of evidence cited up to now, I can turn my attention from here until the end of this section to the semantic dimension of Micznik’s ‘story’ level, to understand if and how these gestural changes of the second part determine semantically discrete musical sections which work as narrative events.

As a consequence of the fact that section A is gesturally uniform, this section contains one only semantic area (bars 1–63, Table 5.3, II, 113). In fact, in this section not only these small units (shown in Ex. 5.1, II, 103–104), but also longer periods (shown in Table 5.1, II, 106) lack the semantic autonomy and discreteness which make them events, according to

Micznik's theory. But the uniformity of this area is not the same as the 'pastoral' topic of the first movement of Beethoven's Sixth, analysed by Micznik in her essay (2001). In the case of this movement, in fact, this long semantic area contains two coexistent intertextual references. Richard Specht (1924, p. 10) describes the main intertextual reference as a topic of 'Bohemian village-inn music'. In particular, features of this folkloric topic are evident from the movement's dance rhythm, which suggests their grotesque and clumsy nature—through, for example, the 'false starting' motive at bar 51 (Ex. 5.6, II, 110, square 1), the '*f*' with dotted notes in the flute at bar 17, and by the melody presented by low instruments from 42 to 61 (Ex. 5.6, II, 110, square 2). The second intertextual reference is a *perpetuum mobile*, which de La Grange (2008, p. 1514) interprets in terms of an Adornian *Weltlauf* ('world's course'), but which in this case seems to refer to the Lieder repertoire, rather than the instrumental or symphonic tradition (though examples undoubtedly exist). Mahler, with this accompaniment formula, perhaps refers to Schubert's Lieder *Gretchen am Spinnrade*, and to *Erlkönig*, where a uniform, cyclic rhythmic accompaniment formula is associated with a verbal text expressing a mood disturbance. The *perpetuum mobile* is also present in Mahler's earlier Lied, 'Das iridische Leben', from *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* (which probably on its own refers to these models), by which this movement was clearly inspired, as pointed out by many scholars, including Specht (1924, pp. 10–11). Not coincidentally, Alma's 'Erntelied' contains this kind of rhythmic movement, in its pantheistic expression of the force of a benign and maternal nature.

The two intertextual references—Bohemian village-inn music and *perpetuum mobile*—fused in a long-lasting semantic area, continue until interrupted, in section B, by the *Erntelied Event*, bar 84. The feature of the text that supports my reading is the cohesive song-like accompaniment of the whole movement. This choice of a unitary semantic area, compared to Mahler's other works, is a clear marker of a low degree of narrativity and of

the lack of the very discreteness that Micznik (2001, p. 218) identifies, instead, in narrative features of the *Ninth*'s first movement (it works like the 'pastoral' topic in Beethoven's *Sixth*, according to Micznik's analysis, 2001, p. 212). It is also true, however, that the coexistence of different intertextual references increases the degree of narrativity; this situation can be seen as the consequence of a 'diseconomy' of extra-musical references and materials. Moreover, locally, within the folk-dance topic in sections A and B, some slight but significant morphologic features lead back to affective and iconic music meanings. In the two periods a–a' plus the refrain (bars 7–24) a mood prevails that is 'mysterious, alarming, bitter-sweet' (according to de La Grange 2008, p. 1514), because of the groups of semiquavers (both in melody and accompaniment) that represent the *Weltlauf*. From bars 25 to 41 the major mode lends a joyful, pastoral character (thanks to the oboe) to the dance topic. Then from bars 42 to 63 there is a reinforcement of the clumsiness of this folk-dance topic, also given by the above-mentioned 'false starting' at bar 50 and the melody in the low instruments from bars 42 to 61 (Ex. 5.6, II, 110, square 2). In all the sections, the minor key of the external refrains *I*, *2+I*, *3* at bar 33 and *I, I+I, I* at bar 49 (indicated in Table 5.1, II, 106) and of the internal refrain *I, 8* at bar 41 (indicated in Table 5.1, II, 106) gives a sudden and brief bitter character. But again, these motives, like the other external and internal refrains, do not have enough morphological and gestural characterisation to demonstrate semantic autonomy.

In section B, from bars 64 to 83 the '*ff*' dynamics and the dotted motive *IV/I* reinforces, in paroxysmal terms, the same previous folk-dance topic, given the prevalence of motivic materials (belonging to groups *I*, *II*, *III*) coming from section A. The continuation of a folk-dance topic previously presented in the movement with a new idea (*IV/I*) can be interpreted as a trace of the narrative detachment between morpho-syntactics and semantics. In other words, in pieces having a low degree of narrativity, a given meaning tends to correspond

more strictly to the morpho-syntactic features to which it is associated at the first presentation of a given musical idea, not at its subsequent occurrences. Instead, here a discrete meaning is identifiable not in *IV/1* but in *IV/2-3-4-5* at bars 84–87, 92–95, 107–108 and 113–114, which are occurrences of the *Erntelied Event*. The semantic content of these occurrences seems obviously determined by the intertextual reference to ‘Erntelied’ by Alma. Moreover, their ‘climactic’ character—indicated by dynamics (*f* at bar 83 and *ff* at bars 106 and 113), long durations, tied and slurred notes and chords, and changes in tempo (*‘Gehalten’*, ‘held’ at bar 107, Ex. 5.7, II, 111, circle 1)—suggests a sudden, different meaning characterised in terms of different ‘time’. The chromatic notes at bars 86–87 (Ex. 5.7, II, 111, square 1) confer to this motive a ‘seductive’ character. These notes are the final part of the first occurrence of the *Erntelied Event* (bars 84–87), but in the later presentations of the same motive they are enigmatically omitted. The quotation motives of ‘Erntelied’ (*IV/2-3-4-5*) are melodically very similar to *IV/1*, as suggested by the numbering used here, so that one can be considered a variation of the other (Ex. 5.1, II, 104). But thanks to different durations and timbre (violins vs. woodwinds), they assume a new connotative meaning. According to Micznik’s model (2001, p. 214), semantic changes of the same musical idea during the work are markers of a high degree of narrativity.

Given the huge semantic variability of the *Erntelied Event*’s occurrences, it could be useful to consider the perspective of de La Grange (2008, p. 1514). He maintains that ‘the tone becomes subjective only when the C motive [the ‘Erntelied’ motive] intensifies at the end of the median episode [at bar 106] and this ascending momentum is immediately interrupted by the opening Perpetuum mobile’. I would argue, however, that this subjective momentum can be anticipated at least at the first appearance of the *Erntelied Event* at bar 84. In fact, from that bar onwards the movement becomes more gestural (thanks to secondary parameters: changes of intensity and tempo).

All the occurrences of the *Erntelied Event* interrupt with their different gesture *Event i* occurrences whose material is ascribable to section A (motive groups *I*, *II* and *III*). After the first *Erntelied Event* occurrence at bars 84–88, the folk-dance topic/perpetuum mobile of section A, which is still present at bars 64–83 (Table 5.3, II, 114), seems to weaken and assumes the topic of ‘carousel music’ of *Event i* occurrences (at bars 89–91, 96–105, 109–112, 115–121; Table 5.3, II, 114), alluding to a childlike world. More specifically, this label of ‘carousel music’ is suggested in these occurrences by their dynamic weakness (*pp subit[o]* at bars 89, 115 and *‘caland[o]’* at bar 97), their ‘mechanic’ metrical regularity and absence of dynamic contrasts. These are features which differentiate this event from the others and which make me think of the naive character of music played by a fairground organ employed in this folk music. To notice this weakening, see also the interruption of the perpetuum mobile at bars 109–111, whose tied and slurred chords are a marker of gestural ‘hybridisation’ of this ‘carousel music’ with the mood of the *Erntelied Event*. On its own, however, these *Erntelied Event* occurrences are interrupted at two significant points. At bar 88, the motive begins at a higher octave, but in the following bars its two notes E and D are shorter than in their previous presentation and assume the appearance of the internal refrain *I/6* (or *I/8*) without its anacrusis (Ex. 5.7, II, 111, square 2).

The second interruption of the *Erntelied Event* is a dramatic fall at bar 95, with the refrain motive *I/3* and the long-lasting ‘*f*’, a dissonant chord, a third inversion of the seventh on the flat supertonic at bars 95–96 (Ex. 5.7, II, 111, square 5). At bar 95 are the words ‘*Tod! Verk!*’ David Matthews (2010, p. 512) thinks these words refer to Wagner’s *Todesverkündigung* (‘annunciation of death’) scene in Act II of *Die Walküre*.<sup>93</sup> This is the movement’s only

---

<sup>93</sup> This interpretation is corroborated by the spelled-out words ‘*Todes ver kündigen*’ on the same bar on page III-DSS. David Matthews (2002, p. 512) also links the inscription ‘*Erbamen*’ to Wagner’s *Parsifal*, Amfortas scene act I, given that this word is put below what it seems a quotation of that passage of Wagner’s opera.

written inscription that—in addition to the autobiographical meaning suggested by Matthews—can be related to the semantics and morphology of the movement. The word ‘*Tod!*’ (‘death’) can be intended as a break of continuity for antonomasia—a death, as the word ‘*Tod!*’ suggests. It is a verbal and dramatised (in the true sense of the term, given the reference to Wagner’s opera) explication of the interruption of the *Erntelied Event* occurrence at bar 95 by the refrain motive I/3.

After the ‘da capo’, as above, there is another idea that because of its individuality can be qualified as a narrative event. It is *Event k*, having two statements of refrain motive I, 13: glissando harp and the tam-tam stroke at bars 168–170 (Ex. 5.8, II, 112). Again, the model here is the coda of ‘Das irdische Leben’, which ends with a similar single cymbal stroke. Here, this glissando harp seems to mean ‘enchantment’, according to an intertextual musical code of a long and shared tradition in nineteenth-century music in opera, programme and ballet music. But this gesture needs to be read in terms of Adornian *Durchbruch*, as a musical gesture that, although posed at the end of the movement, seems to open a new ‘world’. Moreover, the ‘cadence’ is a tonic chord followed by an enigmatic and unresolved chord of the diminished seventh on the raised subdominant. The weakness of closure of this cadence is not compensated by the dynamics (‘*ff*’ and ‘*sfp*’), the glissando, or the tam-tam stroke. The last one of the many occurrences (bars 169–170) of motive group I seems to invoke the reoccurring of another motive of this group.

This *Durchbruch* gesture, then, seems an ‘open finale’, which quickly closes a window on a world (and a time) but does not conclude it. The motive of group I seems to be just an incantatory signal, which closes the parenthetical movement that expresses a childhood world located far in time and space from the surrounding movements. In this view, the entire movement can be seen as isolated from the rest of the Symphony, like the ‘*Nachtmusik*’ of the Seventh or the Adagietto of the Fifth, according to de La Grange’s comparison (2008, p.

1514).

In conclusion, at a morpho-syntactical and semantic level, the movement's first part has only one long-lasting semantic area (bars 1–63), which I have labelled 'Lieder–perpetuum mobile–folk-dance'. In the second part, however, there are a number of recognisably discrete morpho-syntactically and semantically individualised ideas which are comparable to narrative events: the *Erntelied Event*, *Event i*, and *Event k*. In the next section, at Micznik's 'discourse' level, I will try to determine whether the syntagmatic unfolding of these events is comparable to the narrative 'discourse', according to the theoretical parameters identified by Micznik (2001, pp. 219–249).

## 2. The Analysis of the 'Discourse' Level

The dimension of 'discourse' implies a comparison of the actual discursive unfolding of the movement with 'ideal' structural models of conventionalised forms. The huge problem facing us here is in identifying the grounds of this comparison, given the formal singularity of this movement. As a result, the movement's return to a traditional form is a slippery issue in the literature. Coburn (2003, pp. 187–192) discusses the possibility that the movement may be in sonata form, providing interesting arguments in support of this hypothesis—such as the developmental quality of section B. After a deeper discussion based on careful analysis of the movement, however, his conclusion (2003, p. 192) is that the movement presents 'a three-part form, with sonata-like features'. Rothkamm (2003, p. 151) detects in the movement "'thematische" Gestalten' ("thematic" figures') rather than outright themes, and this aspect confirms the difficulty of aligning the movement with sonata form, whose two-theme identity is an important attribute. He also finds in scherzo form another structural reference of the movement (Rothkamm, 2003, p. 152).

The intertextual analysis above, though, strongly supports the vocal origins of the movement. The references to ‘Irdische Leben’ and ‘Erntelied’ and, above all, the regular strophic organization and an almost uniform accompaniment formula of the movement invite us to assign it to the tradition of the modified strophic ABA Lied form. In the movement, this basic formal pattern is influenced by sonata form, given that the first section has the breadth and fluency of a theme (bars 5–63) whose elements are interpolated in the second part (bars 64–121) with the ‘Erntelied’ motive, which certainly does not have the duration and the thematic physiognomy of an outright second theme. The movement, therefore, lacks one of the essential elements of sonata form: the presence of more themes. Consequently, the possible narrative discursive modifications of a conventional form should be sought by considering, as a term of comparison, not only sonata form but also the modified strophic ABA Lied form (Table 5.3, II, 113–115). The question remains whether Micznik’s narrative parameters—which make the musical ‘discourse’ comparable to a narrative—are present in the unfolding of the events identified in the previous section.

Considering one of these parameters—narrative functions—in section A, as shown previously, there is only one semantic area for all periods. So, there are no distinguishable discrete events which on their own can be considered Barthesian ‘nuclei’ or ‘catalysers’. Although the ‘external’ refrains have the prerequisite of morpho-syntactical distinctiveness, they lack semantic autonomy. In section B, however, the situation is more complex. In fact, thanks to its semantic autonomy, the *Erntelied Event* contrasts with the reappearances of the folk dance (bars 64–83) and the ‘carousel’ music (occurrences of *Event i*), which do not have the same semantic discreteness and specificity, being a continuation of a general and long-lasting topic of the first part of the movement. But a discrepancy is detectable between the ‘structural time’, outlined according to the dominant formal scheme (the varied strophic Lied—the regularity of metric alternation of periods), and the alternative time



representation, outlined by the semantic plot—likewise the alternation of *Erntelied Event* and *Event i* occurrences. The discrepancy manifests in the fact that the point of semantic change does not correspond with the alternation of periods. In other words, each period can include both meanings, given the significant morphological changes within it (Table 5.3, II, 114). Considering this, then, in each narrative strophic couplet, *Event i* occurrences have the function of the Barthesian ‘nucleus’, because of the stability determined by the return of materials of the first section. The *Erntelied Event*’s occurrences have, instead, the function of divergent ‘catalysers’ which lead to another time (see the ‘*Gehalten*’ indication at bar 107), thanks to the climactic features. In the coda (bars 168–170) *Event j* can be qualified as a ‘catalyser’ that seems to lead the ‘discourse’ into a new world evoked by the harp’s ‘incantatory’ glissando.

In terms of gestural connotations, if there is no gestural contrast in section A, then only in part B are the musical ideas connoted and individualised gesturally and semantically. In fact, according to the formal conventions for the Lied form, the only conventionalised tonal plot is the relationship between section A—in a minor key—and section B—in the relative major key. In this movement, however, this relationship is not respected, because the home key of section A is B flat minor and in part B is D minor. Moreover, this unconventional tonal relation is replaced by a gestural contrast at bar 64, after the bold combination of a double cadence plus the chromatic slippage of bars 62–64 (Ex. 5.4, II, 108, in the square), which introduces the rustic dotted rhythm of bars 64–83. This gestural contrast is insufficient to change semantic content, however, since bars 64–83 have motivic materials ascribable to section A and belonging to groups *I*, *II* and *III*. The gestural–semantic contrast is delayed until the occurrence of the first *Erntelied Event*, at bar 84—far removed from the liminal point of bar 64 between sections A and B.

With regards to possible temporal discursive processes, the task is to search in the actual discursive unfolding of the movement (or part of the movement) for divergences from both ‘ideal’ conventionalised temporal schemes and a set of temporal parameters established at the beginning of the movement. From this perspective, the first thing to notice in the movement is that the ‘da capo’, the almost identical reprise, is obviously an important marker of a low degree of narrative temporal discursive process. With this exception, which is a rare deviation from the principle of the Adornian ‘variant’ that in Mahler’s music forbids seeking textual repetitions, small but significant clues of narrative strategy are detectable. In fact, the Lied ABA formal model would require a new idea at bar 64, characterising section B. Instead, at that point in the movement a section containing motive *IV/I* begins—but also, as above, melodic and rhythmic references to groups *I*, *II* and *III*, characterising the first part. The real new idea for section B which is expected in that scheme is the first occurrence of the *Erntelied Event* and, above all, its gestural change, which arrives only at bar 84 (Ex. 5.7, II, 111). The occurrence of this motive also begins the cyclic alternation between the *Erntelied Event* and *Event i*, inaugurating a peculiar durational ploy that differs from conventional temporal parameters. It consists of a progressive, regular reduction of the duration of the *Erntelied Event* (5 bars at the first appearance, 4 bars at the second, 3 at the third one, and 2 at the last (Table 5.3, II, 114–115)). This suggests that this progressive reduction of duration is a compensation for the specular loss of vigour of the folk-dance topic in section B. In fact, this dynamic weakening goes from ‘*ff*’ (bars 64) to ‘*subito p.*’ (bar 89), ‘*p*’ (bar 86) and ‘*p subito*’ (bar 115). It is undeniable that this durational ploy contravenes the ‘ideal’ durational scheme of the ABA Lied form, which does not consider this kind of asymmetrical duration of musical ideas. Additionally, in the second part the durational ploy does not follow the durational scheme established at the beginning of the movement. This aspect is due to the enormous disproportion in duration between the

semantic area of part A (Lieder, perpetuum mobile, folk dance) and its prolongation in section B, *Event i*, and the *Erntelied Event*.

The arrival of this narrative plot is also marked by the highest frequency of the events in section B, starting from the arrival of the *Erntelied Event* (bar 84), in correspondence with the tempo changes until the added *Event j* in bars 168–170 (Table 5.3, II, 114–115). There are slightly more tempo changes in part B, compared to part A: ‘*Zeit lassen*’ at bar 97 and ‘*Gehalten*’ at bar 107, versus one only in part A, ‘*Etwas fliessender*’ at bars 25–26. Also, if these aspects are not sufficient to make a narrative interpretation, then Mahler would probably have added tempo indications in the second part, as Cooke and his team have done in their performing edition (1989).

Given the presence of just one event in section A, the only area of the movement in which it is possible to detect some narrative order of events is section B. With the lack of a conventionalised order of musical ideas in the Lied ABA form in the B section, only weak evidence of the order of narrative functions is given by the inversion of events at bars 101–114. In these bars, then, there is the sequence of narrative functions nucleus–catalyser, nucleus–catalyser instead of catalyser–nucleus, catalyser–nucleus of the previous bars 84–96 (Table 5.3, II, 114).

To conclude this section, then, it is only in the second part of the movement that not only are there recognisable musical events, but their unfolding also shows an evident narrative organisation, and this seems to be caused by the eruption in the compositional process of the *Erntelied Event*. The movement is strangely two-faced, given that the first part has a lower degree of narrativity than the second. The identification of the narrativising purpose behind this anomaly is the aim of the next section.

### 3. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the Third Movement

In this section, by the Ecovian ‘intention of the text’, I will attempt to infer a possible narrative intention of an ‘implied author’ and the possible presence in the text of a Genettian ‘narrator’.<sup>94</sup> Moreover, to identify the latter, I will look from the standpoint of the overall level of Genette’s ‘narration’, ‘the act of telling’, ‘the producing narrative action and, by extension, the whole of the real or fictional situation in which that action takes place’ (Genette, 1980, p. 28). Unfortunately, the compositional manuscript materials of the movement (DSS, SS and 30 bars of the OD) lack those numerous, significant changes which, through comparison with the narrativity of sketches and drafts, would enable a process of narrativisation to be identified. The absence of these changes during the compositional process, however, does not mean that one cannot trace an ‘invisible hand’ of the ‘implied author’—one that through the movement’s creative activity modifies and disrupts, in a narrative way, some pre-existing formal schemata. In this movement, these schemata can be identified not in earlier sketches or drafts (probably never composed) before the known manuscript materials, but in some conventional vocal–dance ‘ideal’ schemes Mahler possibly had in mind while composing—like that of one of the movement’s references, the Lied ‘Das irdische Leben’. It is precisely this dimension that needs to be the target of an investigation to identify an overall Ecovian narrative ‘intention of the text’.

From this perspective, then, the hermeneutic challenge of ‘Purgatorio’ starts from its twofold contrasting faces. Ostensibly, this short, vocal-like dance movement has the lowest degree of narrativity of the whole Symphony, as revealed by my analysis above; however, as I will reveal in the fourth and fifth movements, some verbal inscriptions suggest that the

---

<sup>94</sup> The definitions of ‘intention of the text’, ‘implied author’ and ‘narrator’ and their theoretical distinction can be found in Chapter One, respectively on pp. 26 and 40.

movement ‘tells’, as a monologic (in a Bakhtinian sense) ‘autobiography in notes’, an important episode of its composer’s life. My analysis has revealed within this movement an internal two-stage pathway. The first, *Weltlauf*, part A (bars 1–63), and the da capo have a low degree of narrativity, given that they lack discrete events and the subsequent narrative discursive articulation. The second part (bars 64–121), starting from the first *Erntelied* motive (bars 84–88), is articulated in fragments comparable to events, each having its Barthesian function. I note, however, that overall features of closure and cohesion, suggested by the vocal–dance origin of the movement, contrast with the antithetically subtler features of *openness* and *interruption*, which operate in both parts of the movement. From this perspective, the focus should be placed on the refrain group *I* motive that exerts a twofold function in terms of *openness* and *interruption*, especially in the first part. From the side of *openness*, this motive seems to have a function of ‘memory aid’, to remember the longer-lasting motives *II* (e.g., bars 18–22, 29–35) which precede and follow its occurrence. In fact, this motive is ascribable to two of Coburn’s cells (Ex. 3.10, II, 30) of the first movement: cell 1 and, especially, cell 4, which I defined ‘stuttering memory’, used in that movement and in the second as a meta-referential ‘scriptorial’ representation of a process of writing. This aspect suggests that in the text there is a narrator who is forcing his memory by invoking it with this refrain to remember the vocal ‘melody’ of the longer, more fluent motive *II*. In terms of *interruption*, the occurrences of this refrain are even so obsessive that they seem to be an obstacle to the memory of that vocal ‘melody’. In this way, then, it seems that there are two planes: that of the interruptive or invoking motives from group *I*, and that of the more singable (and conjoint) interrupted motives from group *II*, which is ‘recalled’ with difficulty.

In the second part B (bars 64–121) the *interruption/openness* logic is more complex, operating not only at the morpho-syntactic level, as in the first part, but also extending into

the level of semantically autonomous, discrete events in the dimension of ‘discourse’. In other words, it is a contraposing of musical ideas (like motives of groups *I* and *II*), differentiated morphologically but not semantically, as in the movement’s first part. Rather, in the second part there is, from one perspective, mutual, continuous interruption of the *Erntelied Event*’s occurrences at bars 84–87, 92–95, 107–108 and 113–114 and, from another perspective, the occurrence of group motives *I+II* (bars 89–90, 97–106, 108–112, 115–121) contained in *Event i*. Another key passage of the movement leads me to think that the logic of *interruption* of the movement invokes an *openness*, a world outside the movement itself. The final harp-glissando *Event j*, which seems to open a new ‘world’, is typical of an Adornian *Durchbruch*. But the ‘new world’, given that this gesture closes the movement, can only possibly be outside it.

In this framework, one of the few changes during the compositional process of the movement indicates the same kind of narrativising compositional reworking of the other movements in terms of a ‘scriptorial’, meta-referential nature. In fact, at bars 107–108, a tied and slurred chord, the word ‘*Gehalten*’ (‘held’), absent in the DSS, is added only in the SS. The ‘stuttering memory’ cell (bars 106–107; Ex. 5.7, II, 111, circle 2) is also added, which in the first and second movements I have already associated with an ‘effort to recall’ and to a meta-referential ‘scriptorial’ process of stylisation of the compositional process. These added elements alone seem to testify to the narrator’s purpose in alluding (by recalling) to another diegetic ‘time’ of memory differing from the childlike ‘carousel music’.

In addition, along the lines of detecting this ‘scriptorial’, meta-referential, stylised compositional process in this movement, something further can tell us that this time of the *Erntelied Event* occurrences is more recent, a diegetic representation of the movement, than that of *Event i* (‘carousel music’). In fact, at the first occurrence of this *Erntelied Event* (bars 84–88; Ex. 5.7, II, 111, square 3), bars 86–87 attempt a continuation of the fragment from

bars 84–85. Thanks to the chromaticism of bars 86–87, the melody becomes ‘seductive’, and then at bar 88 this motive seems to re-start but is soon interrupted by the carousel music at bar 89, marked ‘*p subito*’ in the SS. The following *Erntelied Event* occurrences never reach the degree of completion and length of that first occurrence. In this way, the ‘implied author’ makes the listener wait in vain for its continuation. From this perspective, if ‘carousel music’ (*Event i* occurrences) is the time of naiveté and childlike or ingenuous perpetuum mobile folk-dance of the first part, the *Erntelied Event*’s occurrences then represent a time of problematic everyday life (Mahler’s marital crisis), erupting into the previous diegetic time representation. According to Rothkamm’s chronology of composition (2003, p. 60; see Chapter Two, section 9), after Gropius’s visit Mahler began to write this movement on 8 August 1910; but he wrote this second part on 9 August, after having read and revised Alma’s *Erntelied*. Given all of this textual and contextual evidence, then, it seems natural that the time of everyday life is for Mahler *specifically* that day when he was composing this second part. These *Erntelied* occurrences in the movement seem to be musical annotations in the movement’s manuscript, which work as ‘sketches’ to be completed later (outside this movement), as an homage to Alma.

Kinderman’s (2006, p. 252) definition (which I mentioned in Chapter One, pp. 35–36) of ‘teleological genesis’, concerning the quotation of the Lied ‘Ich bin der Welt abhanden gekommen’ in the last movement of the Fifth, can here be inverted. As with the ‘sketches’, the *Erntelied Event*’s occurrences here constitute a ‘non-teleological genesis’, given that after the more fluent first occurrence (bars 84–88) the others are more ‘omissive’. In fact, they do not work during the movement as ‘a sort of generative matrix within which this telos is engendered, processed, nurtured, and brought to full presence’ (Kinderman, 2006, p. 252, according to Darcy, 2001). Rather, these *Erntelied Event* occurrences seem to follow an opposite pathway, with their decreasing duration: five bars at the first appearance (bars 84–

88), four at the second (bars 92–95), two at the third (bars 107–108) and two at the last (bars 113–114). The inscription ‘*Tod! Verk!*’ (bar 95, Ex 5.6, II, 111, square 5) makes this meta-referential ‘scriptorial’ process within the product of the last compositional draft of the movement even clearer. Here the indication seems to be a compositional instruction addressed to Mahler’s ‘writing hand’<sup>95</sup> and refers to the *inwardness* of the compositional process instead of its being a mere imaginary or ‘programmatic’ verbal explication of the *outwardness* of music. In other words, with this inscription Mahler is commanding himself to interrupt the *Erntelied Event* again with stronger morphological and gestural devices: the ‘*ff*’ refrain motive *I/3* and the dissonant chord of the seventh of the lowered second at bars 95–96. The dramatic (and operatic, given the musical allusion to Wagner’s *Die Walküre* and *Parsifal*) outwardness is most certainly expressed, but with the mediation of the inwardness of a stylised writing process for those sketches in the ideal musical notebook (a private document)—which the ‘*Purgatorio*’ manuscript has become after Mahler’s discovery of Alma’s liaison with Gropius.

The *Erntelied Event*’s occurrences again deserve a further depth of understanding in relation to Almén’s actoriality. This motive has ‘the status of anthropomorphised subject’ (Almén, 2008, p. 229) in its chromaticism, which might seem to lend it a ‘seductive’, feminine character at the first occurrence. In contrast to *Event y* of the first movement, however, the nature of the *Erntelied Event* is neither oppositional nor active—that is, it does not contrapose other musical ideas but is passive and, given its even shorter occurrences, seems rather submissive. In spite of its passiveness, however, it seems to participate in ‘a narrative trajectory’. In fact, the *Erntelied Event* strips the powers of *Event i* occurrences,

---

<sup>95</sup> This phrase alludes to Mahler’s hand, mentioned in GMAB, 2004, nos. 329 and 330 (see Chapter Two, p. 71). But, as the inverted commas suggest, it also alludes to the nickname many critics gave to Proust. In this twofold sense, I use this phrase from here on (especially in Chapter Eight).



which become ever weaker in dynamics, and ‘infects’ one of them that at bars 109–111, which has tied chords borrowed from the *Erntelied Event* instead of the perpetuum mobile. On its own, this accompanies only the first of the *Erntelied Event* occurrences (bars 84–88), not the other three. These aspects seem to represent a non-oppositional and somehow ‘female strength’ of the emancipation of this event, which acts as a character of the story created by the narrator.

Finally, considering the observations above, I can attempt to answer the initial question. In contrast to its model, ‘Das irdische Leben’, in this movement a naive and childlike world needs to be recalled, from the present time when the movement is being written, by a continuous ‘fixed formula’, the motive group *I*. In this way, this refrain also establishes a critical distance from the ‘story’ it is attempting to tell, in which the narrator is not ‘an actor’ of the theory by Almén (2008, p. 229) and this distance is also conveyed in the subtle deconstructing of song and dance-like regularity. Thus, the persona who recalls is evidently an ‘extradiegetic’ or ‘heterodiegetic’ narrator. In the second part, with the *Erntelied Event* occurrences the narration becomes more ‘scriptorial’, like a flash-forward. The time represented is the moment of writing the movement, with references in the ‘carousel music’ sections to the naive, childlike time of the first part. Like many passages of the first and second movements, Genette’s ‘real or fictional situation in which that action takes place’ (Genette, 1972/1980, p. 28) is what I have defined in Chapter Three, p.116, as the ‘composing hut’, the compositional process stylised in the movement. This leads, finally, to identifying what I suspect to be Mahler’s (intended as Eco’s ‘implied author’) overall sense pursued during the compositional pathway: the irruption of the everyday life in this purgatorial regression to the naive, childlike world. This irruption in the movement, more than a well-worn biographical episode in notes, can be a more mediated, subtle stylisation of a biographical event.

About this aspect, testimonies tell us of a composer's guilty conscience towards Alma for atonement: ““What have I done?” [Mahler] said. “These songs are good—they’re excellent. I insist on your working on them and we’ll have them published”” (AME, 1940/1946, p. 176). Scholarship generally accepts that Mahler’s intention was to represent this personal pathway of expiation autobiographically, as it is evident considering the annotations on the manuscript. From this viewpoint, more specifically, I can say that this personal and artistic process happened in the movement by means of a cathartic childlike regression identified earlier, in the previous sections of this chapter. However, to the established knowledge, my analysis and interpretation add that this expiation happens also, and maybe especially, through the (re)writing of the Lied, in a meta-referential, ‘scriptorial’ procedure. In Celestini’s view (2014, p. 385) this process is a ‘de-identification’ of the autobiographical starting point of the conception of the movement. It is ‘the experience of a shift in the relationship between Self and Otherness’ (2014, p. 385). In this way, the de-identifying Otherness is represented by the fragmentary musical images of Alma in the ‘sketches’ of her Lied. But also, this aspect in the movement is present through the anthropomorphic and actorial representation of Alma, by her entering as another author by means of a musical idea (a motive from her ‘Erntelied’) that works as a foreign body, having a contrasting time representation with that of the rest of the movement. The scenery of this Otherness, though, seems the process of writing—or, better, the act of writing down these ‘sketches’ in the Tenth’s manuscript in a way that works as a notebook or personal diary (as also suggested by the dramatical verbal inscriptions). Once again, the outwardness of external reality to music is assimilated by the music’s inwardness, as Adorno thought, but more specifically by its ‘in progress’ and *unfinished* process of writing, recalling its completion outside the movement—and the listener will have to wait until the fifth movement for that.

# Chapter Six. Narrativity and Narrativisation in the Fourth Movement

In this chapter I will present the analysis of the fourth movement. In sections 1 and 2 I apply the first stage of my analytical approach and will analyse the movement's narrativity at the last manuscript stage. In sections 3–5 I will analyse the entire compositional process, including all existing manuscript materials (two draft short scores). In section 6, my reading key comes from my 'genetic' analysis and is focused on the movement dialectics between, on the one hand, the closure and concision of drama and, on the other, the openness and fluency of narrative.

## 1. The Analysis of the 'Story' Level

This movement contains basic musical units which—thanks to their morpho-syntactic and semantic autonomy—are, on a paradigmatic plane of 'story', comparable to narrative events. These musical units present features of morpho-syntactic fragmentation which can be considered markers of a high degree of narrativity. As in the second, third and fifth movements, there is a process of 'motivic hybridity.' In other terms, also here each of the semantically autonomous events of the movement is composed of short basic motivic semantically non-autonomous units which can recur in other events.

According to Rothkamm (2003, pp. 172–174), these short basic motivic semantically non-autonomous units can be arranged into six groups which from here on I call '*Groups a–e*' (Ex. 6.1, II, 117–119 presents the most important cells and motives of the movement). The semantically autonomous musical ideas (which are thus qualifiable as 'events') that

result from the combination of these basic motivic units can be divided into two types. First are two longer thematic units—a scherzo theme I call ‘*Event a*’ (Ex. 6.2, II, 120) and a trio theme I call ‘*Event b*’ (Ex. 6.3, II, 120)—presented in bars 5–122 and 123–165, respectively. Second are shorter ideas which share melodic and rhythmic materials with the two themes but are gesturally and semantically autonomous from them. These shorter events comprise:

- a refrain motive I call ‘*Event c*’—Ex. 6.4, II, 121 (bars 1–4, 41–44, 111–114, 380–383);
- three longer ideas I call ‘*Event d*’—Ex. 6.5, II, 121 (bars 115–122, 244–247, 398–409), ‘*Event e*’—Ex. 6.6, II, 122–123 (bars 166–173, 225–233), and ‘*Event f*’—Ex. 6.7, II, 124 (bars 287–311);
- two climaxes I call ‘*Event g*’ and ‘*Event h*’—Ex. 6.8, II, 125 and Ex. 6.9, II, 125 (bars 432–443, 505–516).

Given these basic ideas, which are comparable to narrative events, I shall focus on their articulatory morpho-syntactic distinction before examining their definitive marker of narrative status: their semantic autonomy. The two longer themes, *Event a* and *Event b*, are strongly differentiated texturally (Exs. 6.2 and 6.3, II, 120), despite their many common motives. This strong distinction of the two themes is reached through the prevailing recurrence, within each theme, of one or two motives. *Event c* plays a key role in the movement’s phraseology, the movement’s *Event a* and *Event b* occurrences are articulated in a non-symmetrical and regular strophic structure. Outside of this structure, *Event c* functions as a refrain that is morpho-syntactically distinguished by its strong homophonic identity and by pauses and long durations at its end from the adjacent *Event a*’s occurrences characterised instead by a quasi-polyphonic texture. As another marker of morpho-syntactic

autonomy, this refrain is most often situated externally to strophic cycles. In this way Mahler fills what he seems to feel is a gap between periodic cycles, thus breaking the metrical continuity of the movement.

Likewise, *Event d* in its occurrences at bars 115–122 (Ex. 6.5, II, 121), 244–247 and 398–409 is morpho-syntactically distinct. Its intervallic content is ascribable to *Event a*'s motivic materials: motives from *Groups a, b* and *d* in the first two occurrences, to which are added motives from *Groups c* and *e* in the third. In addition, these occurrences are isolated morpho-syntactically by their tonal ambiguity and chromaticism, which contrasts with the greater tonal definition of their surrounding sections and by the frequent occurrence of the syncopated motive of *Group d*. *Event e*, presented in bars 166–173 and 226–23 (Ex. 6.6, II, 122–123, squares 1 and 4), is also morpho-syntactically distinct (as also suggested by the double bars at 166, 173 and 226). Although it presents motivic materials from *Event c* and *Event b* (respectively indicated by squares 3, 6 and 2, 5 in Ex. 6.6, II, 122–123), these materials are fused in the same gesture, distinguished by long note values and dynamics (*ff*).

As a further expression of a stronger motivic autonomy, throughout the movement a process of motivic hybridisation appears not only at a first level of single short motives but also, at a second level, in entire phrases, ascribable to one of the two themes presented during the occurrence of the other theme. This aspect is evident, for example, within the first occurrence of *Event b* (bars 123–165; Ex. 6.10, II, 126, square 1 and 2) where the motivic material of bars 153–165 (square 2 in Ex. 6.10) is ascribable both to *Event b* and to *Event a* (square 3 in Ex. 6.10). A similar case is at bars 323–328, where material from *Event b* is in the middle of an occurrence of *Event a* (Table 6.2, II, 133). As in the previous case, the insertion always happens without conflict, and these musical ideas of *Event a* or *Event b* are perfectly integrated into the other event. A subtle form of motivic hybridisation occurs at bars 444–451. This section is related motivically to *Event a* (*Groups b* and *c*); however, the

rough, schematic, waltz-accompaniment formula of these bars (bars 444–451) is borrowed from *Event b*. The most remarkable example of hybridisation is *Event f*, bars 287–311 (Ex. 6.7, II, 124). This section consists of bars 287–290—whose materials are derived intervallically from *Group a* and harmonically from *Event d*—and bars 290–311, which present motives from *Group a* and *c* that are characteristic of the first and second theme, respectively.

Other elements playing an important role are the climaxes, which, as Coburn (2002, pp. 214–225) pointed out, can be categorised into two types. The first type, which he names ‘build-up climaxes’, has the function of completing the last conclusive part of *Event a*, and for this reason these climaxes are not morpho-syntactically autonomous. The climaxes of the second type, on the contrary, are ‘consistently interruptive’ and occur at bars 269–277, 432–443 and 505–520 of *Event b* (Coburn, 2002, p. 219). Coburn limits the interruptive status to just the second and third climax (*Events g* and *h*, at bars 432–443 and 505–520, respectively), given that Mahler integrated the first one ‘into [*Event b*] more than the next two occurrences’ (Coburn, 2002, p. 222). In my analysis below, however, I consider all three of these climaxes to function autonomously in the movement in terms of their syntactic relationships to the other events. According to Coburn (2002, p. 223), ‘the second occurrence of the type-2 climax also interrupts [*Event b*] [...], but it now acts as a transition to a scherzo section’. In support of this separation, he indicates the double bar lines that Mahler places before and after the section. Moreover, he sees this occurrence of the second type of climax as autonomous, because if the motivic content of this section seems to lead back to *Event a*, this section also ‘seems not to be part of the ensuing scherzo by virtue of its extremely different texture and character’ (Coburn, 2002, p. 223). To go beyond Coburn’s observations, I notice that the last two climaxes—*Events g* and *h*—make use of melodic materials drawn from the motto-refrain *Event c* at bars 41–44, itself morpho-

syntactically autonomous, helping to mark them as autonomous from *Event a*.

Another observation completes this morpho-syntactical analysis and concerns the fragmentation of melodic and metric continuity. The beginning of the movement provides us with a good example of this feature. Here there is a break in melodic continuity when in the SD the melody in the first upper voice, starting in bar 6 and continuing until bar 11 (Ex. 6.11, II, 127, square 1), stops suddenly and restarts only at bar 19 (Ex. 6.11, square 4). After this break, melodic continuity is restored in the lower voices only between bar 14 and bar 21 (Ex. 6.11, square 2). The resulting gap between these melodically continuous blocks is filled by a melodic fragment at bars 11–14. This short musical idea interrupts the melodic and metrical activity in the first upper voice (Ex. 6.11, II, 127, square 1) by the repetition in contrary motion of the same motive (square 3, Ex. 6.11). In fact, in the first lower voice there is a four-quaver *Group a* motive, later imitated by inversion by the second upper voice in bar 14 (ovals in square 3, Ex. 6.11).

At bars 23–24 there is another similar break. Here the period stops with an octave of two dotted minims (a motive from *Group a*) at bar 22 (Ex. 6.12, II, 128, square 1) and the new period begins at bar 25 (Ex. 6.12, square 2). This gap is filled by two four-quaver motives from *Group a*, before a closing trio of crotchets in the first upper voice at bar 24 (see circles in Ex. 6.12). A further breaking of melodic–phraseological continuity is given by the refrain–motive in bars 19–22. This idea (Ex. 6.13, II, 128 in the square) is ascribable to refrain *Event c*, but it operates inside a period that ends at bar 24, not externally, like the occurrences of this event. From now on I will use the term ‘internal refrain’ for this idea that does not seem to me gesturally and semantically autonomous, like the above presented *Events a–h*.

But after these breaks there is another longer construction of melodic and metric continuity. So, from bar 57 until a new *Event c* occurrence arrives (bars 111–115), an

uninterrupted melody is achieved which begins in the upper voice, without any interruption from pauses, *Event c*, or long note values. In this passage the melody is cantabile-like, with fewer leaps, culminating in what Coburn (2002, p. 214) defines as a ‘first-type climax’ (bars 99–110). Given these features, the section can be assumed to be a ‘completion’ of a process of constructing thematic continuity, from the fragmentary discursive unfolding of the previous 56 bars. The combination of external refrain and internal breaks in continuity at the beginning of the movement is represented in Table 6.1, II, 129.

The morpho-syntactic autonomy of basic musical ideas is a necessary but not sufficient condition for their assimilation into narrative events. In fact, what characterises a piece as having a high degree of narrativity is a ‘semantic differentiation’ of musical ideas, which in their discreteness are articulated during the piece like events of a novel or a tale. Having now identified the elements which characterise the morpho-syntactic autonomy of this movement’s basic musical ideas, it is time to highlight the markers—their semantic autonomy and distinction—that make them definitely comparable to narrative events.

A starting point in identifying these semantically discrete events is provided by Floros (1985, p. 307), who defines the movement as ‘a mixture of a demonic scherzo and a tender happy waltz’. This reading seems appropriate, provided that this ‘mixture’ is intended not as alternation of these characters during the movement (as the scherzo form suggests) but rather in its having two faces, expressing an ‘inside’ and an ‘outside’ of the same suffering mood. These two semantic poles are expressed by the marginal annotation in the SD, ‘*Der Teufel tanz es mit mir*’ (‘The devil is dancing with me’), an image of intimate personal suffering. This is expressed more directly by another sentence, ‘*Wahnsinn, fass mich an, Verfluchten!*’ (‘Madness, touch me, damn you!’).

The semantic affinity between the two themes (an ‘inside’ and ‘outside’, or demonic scherzo and tender waltz) is doubtless suggested by the ‘hybridisations’ I identified earlier



(p. 182). Hence, it seems natural to assimilate the two themes semantically. Coburn (2003, p. 313), for instance, associates the image of the devil with the passage having the superscription ‘*Tanz*’ (bar 219), as seems natural, and also with a flat supertonic chord in the recurring refrain *Event c* (Coburn, 2002, p. 377). Rothkamm (2003, p. 181) relates the superscription ‘*Wahnsinn, fass mich an, Verfluchten!*’ to the character of *Event a* and *Event c*. In the first theme (*Event a*), the octave leaps, the dance-like rhythmic movement, and a feverish quasi-polyphonic gesture certainly enhance this interpretation. Intertextually, this musical *Wahnsinn* leads back to the jerking, paroxysmal gestures of a symphonic, operatic demoniac and cursed expressivity as established during nineteenth- and early twentieth-century music.<sup>96</sup> To these observations, I would add that, thanks to the *fff* octave, *Event c* evokes an affective meaning that I would describe as ‘wincing’, which is distinct from the first theme it introduces, thanks to the morpho-syntactic discontinuities mentioned above.

Concerning *Event b*, Coburn’s (2002, p. 313) reference to the image of ‘devil’ in the ‘*Tanz*’ episode, suggested by the superscription, evidently needs to be enlarged to this entire idea, given its status as a waltz. Rothkamm (2003, p. 181) attributes a ‘cheerful’ character to this theme, in the light of Floros’s reading of a ‘tender happy waltz’. This reading of a ‘positive’ *Event b*, however, seems to overlook its parodic-sardonic features, which lead us back to the devil or madness as a possible metaphorical agent of the ‘*Tanz*’. Between *Event a* and *Event b*, the morpho-semantic features of *Event d* isolate it semantically from them. The altered notes, the harmonic uncertainty, and the frequent syncopations lead back to a consolidated nineteenth-century musical intertextual code (from Berlioz’s *Symphonie fantastique* onwards) to indicate a ‘magical’ or ‘supernatural’ character. Another morpho-syntactically autonomous idea is *Event e*, which, like *Event d*, is also transitional. In both its

---

<sup>96</sup> Mahler’s borrowing from Liszt’s demoniac and cursed expressivity, and from the techniques of melodic and harmonic distortion used by Liszt and Berlioz, have been well documented by Floros (1977/2014, pp. 57–74).

presentations, the idea is associated with the refrain in its final part, suggestive of waiting for *Event a*. One can certainly hear *Event f* as one of those passages that Adorno characterised as *Suspension*. So, the semantic label ‘Dreamlike music’, given by de La Grange (2008, p. 1520) at bars 287–311, seems a useful way to express the extra-temporality of this section. According to their gestural autonomy, the two climaxes *Events g* and *h* do not seem to have semantic content ascribable to *Event a*, as Coburn thinks (2002, p. 223). Instead, their affinity with the melodic material of the motto *Event c* at bars 41–44 makes these events autonomous and parenthetical, like *Events c, d, e* and *f*.

Another important marker of narrativity is the semantic evolution of the events during the movement. In this Scherzo it is possible to locate significant examples of this aspect, even within the single presentation of an event. For example, at bar 57 a new thematic group arrives and achieves an uninterrupted melodic continuity until bar 115. In this ‘cantabile’ I hear a gesture of a narrative Lied’s continuity, where this is an essential feature for the listener to follow the narrated story. This ‘telling’ seems an ordered construction of a melodic–thematic continuity (an apparent ‘completion’ of the ‘narrative’) from the previous fragmentary, discontinuous paroxysmal dance.

Probably the most remarkable semantic evolution affects *Event b*. Presented first in a ‘cheerful character’, the idea semantically changes later in its subsequent occurrences. At bar 219, the episode labelled by Mahler as ‘*Tanz*’, according to de La Grange (2008, p. 1520), assumes a ‘parodic’ character, ‘imitating popular music’. The alternation with *Event a* then weakens *Event b* (bars 517–548) until the episode at bars 549–578—a ‘death march’, a label suggested to Coburn by the march-like rhythm (Coburn, 2002, p. 233). Here the music is reduced to a rhythmic skeleton of the ‘noise music’<sup>97</sup> *avant la lettre* of the coda—

---

<sup>97</sup> By the phrase ‘noise music’ I refer to that twentieth-century musical style first theorised by Luigi Russolo (1916), characterised by an expressive use of noise.

‘pk’ (an abbreviation for ‘Pauken’, ‘timpani’) at bar 549—to express an idea of ‘Physischen Verenden des musikalische Ichs’ (‘physical perishing of the musical self’), according to Rothkamm’s brilliant definition (2003, p. 183).

The final point of this lugubrious pathway is the last stroke of a ‘*vollständige gedämpfte Trommel*’ (‘completely dampened drum’), indicated in the manuscript at the final bar 578. This probably refers to an autobiographical episode—the funeral march of a fireman that Alma and Mahler observed from a window of a hotel in New York.<sup>98</sup> Rothkamm (2003, p. 183) sees this final part of the movement as a fight between the ‘madness’ of *Event a* and the cheerful waltz of *Event b*. In this suggestive and pertinent reading, we might see that this poor waltz (and the ‘musical self’ that it bears) is destined for death (as indicated by the Death March). Or is it a fiction within the framing fiction of the Symphony, a dreaming and incidental diversion stopped by the drum stroke that calls to reality? Answering this question needs other levels of analysis discussed below in sections 2–6.

## 2. The Analysis of the ‘Discourse’ Level

At the level of their unfolding during the movement, these morpho-syntactically and semantically discrete basic musical ideas show a narrative articulation which confers other layers of meanings onto them. More specifically, Micznik’s narrative dimensions are detectable: narrative functions, gestural connotations and temporal discursive processes. I thus start with the key dimension of the comparison of the actual formal pathway of the movement with traditional formal schemata. At a macro-formal level, it is possible to detect a roughly tripartite scherzo sonata form (Coburn, 2002, p. 202; Rothkamm, 2003, pp. 177–

---

<sup>98</sup> This episode is mentioned by Alma Mahler AME, 1940/1946, p. 135, de La Grange (2008, p. 1521) and others.

180). This form results from hybridisation of conventional scherzo and sonata forms and is observable in many works, for example, by Schumann, Chopin, Brahms. The fact that this hybrid was not codified within the *Formenlehre*, however, makes it likely that the ‘reified’ conventional schemes Mahler had in mind for this movement could be the separate and more conventional forms of scherzo and sonata rather than their combination.

At any rate, the movement’s derivation from the form of scherzo is quite evident (as per its title). The scherzo–trio pair (*Event a–Event b*) acts as a free strophic-variation pattern, occurring seven times during the movement: once during the exposition, three times during the development and three times during the recapitulation (Table 6.2, II, 130–135).<sup>99</sup> Moreover, the occurrences of *Events c, d, e, f* and *g* (all of which are derived from *Event a* and *Event b*, but morpho-syntactically autonomous) are inserted before, after or between each occurrence of the two themes of this recurring pattern.

In contrast to the first movement of Mahler’s Ninth Symphony, as analysed by Micznik (2001), the movement’s strophic organisation finds weaker support in the movement’s tonal organisation. In fact, in the first movement of the Ninth the first member of the strophic pair—the first theme—is always in the same key. This does not happen for either of the two themes of this movement, which is an example of ‘progressive tonality’, because the movement begins and finishes in different keys—E minor and D minor (Table 6.2, II, 130–135). This means that in spite of its clear-cut, symmetric, dance-like scherzo form, the movement is tonally still less predetermined than the first movement of the Ninth which, according to the conventional sonata form, finishes in the same key as at the beginning. This

---

<sup>99</sup> Table 6.2, II, 130–135, similarly to Tables 3.1 (II, 37–39), 4.1 (II, 77–79), 5.3 (II, 113–115), 7.1 (II, 176–178) presents, over six pages, a compilation of different methods of analysing and labelling the sectional divisions of the movement. Coburn’s description of a hybrid scherzo sonata form is placed alongside Rothkamm’s identification of motive *Groups*, Micznik’s suggestion of strophic form, and my own narratological analysis. The discussion below will follow the labels set out in this table.

progressive movement's tonal pathway sounds regressive within the movement's 'narrative', because of its moving from the key of a higher (E minor) degree to a lower one (D minor) of the diatonic scale. This 'falling' can definitely be linked to the fictive (or dramatic) extra-musical plot of Rothkamm's 'physical perishing of the musical self', suggested also by annotations on the manuscript. This teleological pathway contrasts with the circular tonal organisation of the sonata form and of the strophic song form (both of which require the return in the same key of previously presented ideas).

Searching for narrative functions, we should consider that the tonal dialectics between the returns of the two themes and the episodes between them are similar to the *Ninth*'s first movement. The returns of the two themes and their gestural recognisability and harmonic stability make a Barthesian narrative function of 'nucleus' ascribable to them. So, they are 'cardinal functions' and 'hinges' (in Barthes's terms) of the movement's narrative.

The nature of an act of 'recounting' of a 'cardinal fact' (still using Barthes's terms) in *Event a* is particularly evident in the ordered 'construction of telling' (as per my label in Table, 6.2, II, 133) at bars 57–110, from the fragmentary and discontinuous paroxysmal bars 5–56. The process of 'telling' of the entire *Event a* assumes the nature of a Barthesian 'nucleus'. By contrast, the less conventional episodes within the returns of the two themes—*Events c, d, e* and *f*—play the function of Barthesian 'catalysers'. Such narrative events 'fill in the narrative space separating the hinge functions, accelerate, delay, give fresh impetus to the discourse, summarize, anticipate and sometimes even lead astray' (Barthes, 1967/1977, p. 95). Given that the motto-refrain *Event c* anticipates the initial motive of *Event a*, the former during the movement articulates the form, pushing the action forward. *Event d*, with its 'magical' character—due especially to its harmonic and intervallic content—leads the discourse astray, suggesting a suspension of the 'discourse' moving it to another parenthetical location. Especially at its first occurrence (at bars 115–122), after the

thematically complete ‘discourse’ of *Event a* (a nucleus), I would say that this *Event d* works metaphorically like a votive invocation to the Muses to remember the following fact—*Event b* (which is another nucleus). *Event e* in its two occurrences—with its semantic nature of ‘waiting for something to happen’ because of its harmonic, melodic and rhythmic stasis—delays the ‘discourse’ of the two themes begun before and continued after them. *Event f* is probably the most suspensive of the movement, with a harmonic, melodic and rhythmic stasis that leads the ‘discourse’ of the alternation of two nuclei astray. Because of their features as transitional sections and their use of melodic materials of the motto–refrain at bars 41–44, the two interrupting climaxes *Event g* and *Event h* can also be described as ‘catalysers’ in their transitional discursive function. But in the first case, bars 432–443, the climax *Event g* leads the ‘discourse’ from *Event b* to *Event a* (Table 6.2, II, 134), and in the second case, *Event h*, bars 505–516, interrupts *Event b* in the middle of its occurrence, and so leads *Event b* astray.

The movement presents many gestural connotations, especially in the final part. In one of these connotations (bars 111–131), the sonata form’s conventional tonal dialectics between first theme/scherzo and second theme/ trio is replaced by the contraposition of their different gestures. In fact, according to sonata form’s codified (and reified) tonal organisation, since the movement began in E minor, the trio (*Event b*) should be in G major, but this key is never used during the movement; rather, its first presentation is in C major. This key is not reached directly from that of *Event a*’s closing key of E minor, but Mahler instead chooses a long, digressive pathway from the (tonally uncertain) E major of the first occurrence of the catalyser *Event d* (bars 115–122), which follows *Event a* and precedes *Event b*. This procedure further weakens the already weak unconventional tonal relationship between *Event a* and *Event b* and is explicable only through the gestural pathway Mahler employs. He compensates for this tonal weakness with a gestural device of more

immediately perceptual reference to ‘more universal (thus semantic) concepts’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 225). At bar 111 a new occurrence of the refrain *Event c* (in a weaker form, without the motto–motive but within the same harmonic scheme) concludes *Event a*. Then at bar 115, the parenthetical occurrence of *Event d* presents a different gesture (with ‘magical’ chromaticism). Furthermore, as I have done for some passages in the first and second movements, I can develop Samuels’ ideas I welcomed in Chapter One about the stylistic borrowings of the first movement of Mahler’s Fourth Symphony. I can say, then, that the passage from the ‘past tense’ of the tonal definition of *Event a* (E minor) to the ‘present tense’ of the harmonic uncertainty of *Event d* seems to be a temporal step forward in the diegetic pathway of the movement. Similarly, but in an opposite temporal pathway, the passage of bars 123–124 from the chromaticism of *Event d* to the diatonicism of *Event b* seems a temporal step back.

Moreover, in the diegesis of the movement, the diatonicism of the second theme (*Event b*) appears to be a temporal step back not only from *Event d* but also from the first theme, *Event a*. Considering this evidence, then, the tonal plot seems not only not in accordance with a predetermined convention but also subordinate to the gestural–semantic plot that, according to Subotnik, works as an ‘analogous’ structure which seems to be an example of ‘other, autonomous layers of meaning’ (Subotnik, 1981, p. 85). The quality of the two themes as ‘two opposite sides [*sic*] of the same coin, as two components of the same strophe’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 227) is detectable in the above hybridisation (p. 184) of the first level, of single short motives, but also of the second level, of entire phrases. This hybridisation is an expression of two sides—‘Wahnsinn’ (‘madness’) and ‘der Teufel’ (‘the Devil’)—of the same coin, the same subjective state. They express two coessential aspects of a single intimate conflict.

At the level of temporal discursive processes, the events do not follow the duration,

frequency, speed or order codified for either scherzo form or sonata form, nor even the temporal patterns established by Mahler at the beginning of the movement. Instead, these temporal processes seem related to the above-mentioned extra-musical plot of ‘physical perishing of the musical self’. This content has its foundation in the gestural conflict between *Event a* and *Event b*, a ‘fight’ in which *Event b* prevails, given that by the last strophe it alone is present, though reduced to a musical skeleton in the coda (bars 549–578). Also, the duration of events participates in this plot. The durational ploy of this movement has as a starting point the supremacy of *Event a*—in that it lasts 104 bars in the exposition (the longest duration of a single event in the movement)—and as a final outcome, the prevalence of *Event b*. In fact, this is presented at the end of the movement twice, without the otherwise always-paired scherzo, in strophes VII and VIII, respectively, for a total of 57 bars. Between these two blocks—to be precise, between bars 112 and 516—the durations of events appear extremely variable, and not related to a regular durational schema. The ‘revenge’ of *Event b* is expressed in the development and in the recapitulation, and also by its increase in duration compared to that of *Event a*.

The highest frequency of events is detectable in the development and, especially, in the recapitulation. This narrative aspect thus also corroborates the interruptive discursive plot of the final part of the movement. Concerning the speed of the events, the SD, given its state of incompleteness, does not show tempo indications. It is highly likely, however, that Mahler would have added them with further refinement, as he did for drafts of the other movements. In any case, many changes in tempo are implicit in the rhythms of different gestures. The movement offers convincing evidence of temporal manipulation of the expected order of musical ideas, coming from traditional patterns or temporal parameters established at the beginning of the movement. From this perspective, the plot of ‘physical perishing of musical self’ finds a significant analogy with the ‘farewell’ plot (Micznik, 2008, p. 243), detectable



in the first movement of the Ninth. Unlike in that work, however, this plot happens not in terms of inversions of events in the expected discursive order but in those of Genette's 'paralipsis' (see Chapter One, p. 11). In other words, there are omissions of expected events according to a prior temporal pattern of alternation established from the beginning of the movement, a situation that determines a new discursive unfolding, which is both elliptical and unpredictable. The movement, then, exhibits two types of discursive omissions: one regarding events, and the other regarding parts of events. For the first type, an example occurs in the development: after *Event a*'s occurrence in bars 312–379, there is no *Event b*. This absence seems linked directly to two aspects. First, the character of *Event a* at bars 312–379: here in fact this theme goes from its previous presentation of 'paroxysmal' and 'mad' to joyful, celebrating its provisory triumph with a climax at bar 377. With its force, it 'steals' the A major key from the previous presentation of *Event b* at bars 248–277 and annihilates its rival, which is absent in strophe IV. This (temporary) defeat of *Event b* has an earlier antecedent at the end of the previous presentation of *Event b*, bars 248–277. Here, as Coburn (2002, p. 230) pointed out, a sudden climax 'acts as a dominant to the resumption of [*Event b*] material, but it is nonetheless completely disruptive of [*Event b*]'s unfolding'. In fact, this section seems unstructured and incomplete, according to Coburn: 'if it had not been part of Mahler's conception in the earliest state of this section, one might assume Mahler had inserted it later' (Coburn, 2002, p. 230). At bar 278, after the climax, *Event b* attempts to resume but is stopped by *Event f*.

*Event a*'s victory over *Event b* is only provisory and illusory, though. Later in the recapitulation and the coda it is *Event a* that will be omitted, twice. Thus, at bars 517–548 and 549–578, *Event b* is presented without *Event a*. The omission is the outcome of a process of gradual perishing. In the recapitulation, this omissive–discursive strategy is doubtless more intensive than in the development. Coburn (2002, pp. 213–214) notices that the

‘modification of the sixth statement of the refrain and its complete absence thereafter help to define the return of the scherzo–trio complex’, and that Mahler used a variation of the refrain structure rather than the tonal change. The other type of omissive process regards single parts of events. In the recapitulation, the shortening of the duration of *Event a* corresponds to the omission of some of parts of this event (Table 6.3, II, 136).

At bars 384–397, then, this event is without a section corresponding to bars 57–106 of the exposition: this is the section I have labelled ‘cantabile’, to which I have ascribed a semantics of ‘construction of telling’ continuity. This omitted part is displaced to bars 452–494 (and shortened). But this time it is not preceded by the section corresponding to bars 21–64 of the exposition—the ‘paroxysmal’ dance—but by bars 444–450, in which features of *Event a* are recognisable (motives from *Groups b* and *c*). These bars (444–450) have very little to do with the gestural ‘madness’ of the exposition, as expected before the ‘cantabile’, and the origin of *Event a*’s decline is in them alone. The second level of ‘hybridisation’ reveals the disquieting face of a disease which will cause the ‘death’ of this musical idea. In fact, *Event b* with its waltz accompaniment ‘infects’ *Event a* (just recalled by motives of *Group b* and *c*) into these bars, with *Event a* destined to die, as just hinted by its disappearance from bar 495. From this point of view, the double bar-line at the beginning of bar 452 is significant. In the absence of a key change, it suggests that Mahler wanted a conceptual separation of these seven bars from the restatement of the (shorter) ‘construction of telling’ and its completion (first-type climax).

So, in its ‘fight’ with *Event b*, *Event a* is disarticulated, loses bits of itself and is shortened in a framework of increasing incompleteness and fragmentation until the astonishing ‘noise music’ of the coda (*Event b*’s occurrence in bars 549–578), where the musical matter is reduced to a bare rhythmic skeleton.

To sum up, the movement presents a high degree of narrativity that depends on a

strong gestural plot, in which a dramatic gestural contrast of the two themes coexists with narrative elliptical catalysers of *Events c, d, e* and *f*. The problematic dialectics of these two worlds—drama and narrative—is the main issue that can be addressed by the analysis of narrativity of the compositional process in the next three sections.

### 3. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 1–165 (Exposition)

At the ‘story’ level of my analysis, a progressively gestural definition of the basic ideas and their subsequent acquisition of semantic autonomy make them, during the compositional process, comparable to narrative events. Additionally, a progressive increase in the degree of narrativity during the compositional process shows a process of narrativisation. In this view, then, the genetic evolution of *Event c* in its two occurrences (bars 1–4 and 111–114) is significant. The first occurrence is absent in the earliest manuscript page, IV-FD1 (Ex. 6.14, II, 137). Only on page IV-FD3 is there a germinal rhythmic pattern of *Group b* motives that is very similar to bar 3 (Ex. 6.14, square 1). The harmonic basis of this occurrence (Ex. 6.14, square 2) is on the following page, IV-FD4. This process of refinement continues in the SD, where there are many cancellations in these same bars.

Considering this evidence, then, the movement begins in a traditional way, directly with *Event a*. Page by page, with the gradual development of bars 1–4, the beginning of the dance-like movement (remember that the movement is a Scherzo) is gradually contaminated by an epic-like formal element: the refrain, *Event c*. As in other movements, the narrator needs an epic ‘fixed formula’—*Event c*—recurring during the movement, to collect and combine his musical ideas, as an oral storyteller does. As a clue to the narrativisation of a pre-existing dance-like formal scheme, it is also significant that what I defined early in this chapter (p. 186) as the ‘internal refrain’ (bars 19–12) is conceived only on IV-FD3 as a part of an insert of IV-FD1.

It is also remarkable that both occurrences of *Event c*, bars 1–4 and 111–112, have a ‘dissociated’ genesis in different parameters. In fact, the occurrence of *Event c* at bars 1–4 is conceived first rhythmically, on IV-FD3, and then harmonically, on IV-FD4 (Ex. 6.14, II, 137, squares 1 and 2). In the SD, first the two previous versions of this event are combined, where instrumental indications — ‘*Holz*’, ‘*Tr.*’ ‘*Hr*’ (‘woodwinds’, ‘trumpets’ ‘horns’) are added. Added to these elements are also octave leaps (a motive from *Group a*). Then on the same FD page, Mahler cancelled two dotted motives from *Group b* and one motive from *Group a* (indicated with circles 1, 2 and 3, respectively, in Ex. 6.14).

The following occurrence at bars 111–114 also has a dissociated genesis. First it is conceived melodically, on IV-FD1 (this occurrence then continues melodically on IV-FD2), and then both harmonically and melodically in the cancelled bars 113–114 of IV-FD4 (Ex. 6.15, II, 138, squares 1, 2 and 3). In both cases of these two occurrences, after an initial conception of a melodic and/or rhythmic idea, Mahler focuses his attention on its harmonic basis by conceiving a sequence of chords separately from its melody and rhythm. In the genesis of these two occurrences, then, Mahler’s strategy was to render these occurrences more homophonic and chordal. In this way their autonomy increases and they are differentiated gesturally from the quasi-polyphonic texture of the first and second themes.

The double bars without a change of key signature are important markers of this narrative purpose of distinguishing these occurrences from the two themes.<sup>100</sup> This happens on IV-FD3 and IV-FD4, for the occurrence at bars 1–4 (Ex. 6.14, II, 137, squares 1 and 2), and on IV-FD1 and IV-FD2, for the occurrence at bars 111–112 (Ex. 6.15, II, 138, squares 1 and 2). As confirmation of this purpose, at the occurrence in bars 1–4 of the SD, see the many notes

---

<sup>100</sup> There are enough clues at other points of the movement to suspect that in this movement Mahler intended the double bars as a way to conceptually divide the movement’s sections in his composing process—often also in absence of change of key signature or of actual tonality. See, for example, bars 174 and 379 in the SD, and page IV-FD14 (see Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, pp. 122, 123, bars 450, 495 and 504).

which were cancelled because they would otherwise have made the musical idea less homophonic (Ex. 6.14, circles 1, 2 and 3). In this way, during the compositional process, the gestural and semantic distinguishability from the two themes increases in these occurrences of *Event c*, and they can gradually acquire the autonomous narrative functions I will describe later.

Another narrativising process concerns *Event a*. It is evident that Mahler completed (by insertions) and refined this idea during the compositional process by increasing the number of motives involved. In this way, the morphological ‘diseconomy’ of motivic materials, which Micznik (2001) associates with a high degree of narrativity, progressively increases. In particular:

- the *Einlage* section, bars 57–94, on IV-FD5 and in the SD, also includes motives (circled in Ex. 6.16, II, 139) from *Group e*, bars 64, 69, 76, 77 that were absent in bars 1–56 as sketched on the previous pages IV-FD1–4, other than motives from *Groups a, b, c* and *d* which were present in those previous pages;
- on IV-FD1, the section at bars 95–106 contains motives belonging to four *Groups*—*a, b* (which is prevalent), *e* and *d*. But on the following page IV-FD5, and in the SD, the same section contains motives belonging to five *Groups* by inclusion of a motive (circled in Ex. 6.16, II, 140) from *Group c* at bar 97.

The occurrence of *Event d* in bars 115–122 on the earliest page IV-FD4 was conceived in its homophonic identity, contrasting gesturally, like *Event c*, with the two themes (*Event a* and *Event b*). The last compositional stage enhances the tonal and gestural autonomy and differentiation of *Event d*, bars 115–122. In fact, this occurrence assumes a more definite tonality (E major) in the SD (where Mahler wrote a key signature with four sharps) instead

of a tonally more ambiguous E minor (or E major) key of the FD (squares 1 and 2 in Ex. 6.17, II, 141 show these two versions). Probably the passage was already thought of as E Major in the FD, but what seems certain is Mahler's intention to enhance the gestural differentiation of this idea by making it tonally more differentiated from the E minor of the first theme.

This process of increasing narrativity during the compositional process is also detectable in terms of semantics. *Event c* at bars 1–4 becomes more gestural during the compositional process, and a dynamic indication (*ff*) was added in the SD. The above-mentioned changes during the compositional process make *Event a*'s occurrence seem more nervous in its first section (bars 5–56). In the first part of this event (bars 1–57), this character is conveyed by addition of the syncopated and nervous *Group d* motive in the SD. The changes during the compositional process in *Event a*'s second section (bars 58–110) make it calmer and more orderly. For this purpose, the insertion of bars 57–104 in IV-FD5, which were absent in the previous pages IV-FD1, IV-FD3 and IV-FD4, instead provides the semantic feature of a 'calm' and uninterrupted 'cantabile' melody.<sup>101</sup>

If we turn to the 'discourse' level—the analysis of the discursive unfolding of events—a process of narrativisation during the compositional process is detectable in the dimensions of narrative functions, gestural connotations, duration and frequency. Looking at narrative functions, the progressive definition of *Event c* in homophonic terms differentiates it from the quasi-polyphonic *Event a*. Its brevity (compared with the longer durations of *Event a* and *Event b*), its being a refrain, and the double bars used without key changes, leave no doubt that Mahler considered *Event c* parenthetical and additional to the 'discourse' he had sketched previously. All of the features which make this event a Barthesian catalyser also

---

<sup>101</sup> See the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, pp. 90–93.

occur in *Event d*, conceived directly in its homophonic identity. Instead, the changes during the compositional process of *Event a* raise its more conventional thematic fluency, especially for the added section of bars 57–98 of IV-FD5. These aspects make this event a Barthesian nucleus, a quality acquired from the first conception of *Event b*.

By carefully observing the chronology of the movement's first 99 bars, one glimpses some clues to a peculiar narrative plot. Once Mahler found a fixed formula—*Event c* (bars 1–4 and 111–114)—through gradual, subsequent refinement he could collect and order the fragments of a musical 'discourse' by inserting bars 57–99 on page IV-FD5. The 'telling' thus finally begins to be more fluent and orderly. Considering the temporal discursive processes, the progressive addition of bars 57–104, inserted at a later stage on IV-FD5 (see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, 1, pp. 91–94) within *Event a*, obviously determines the increased duration of this event. Similarly, the addition at the beginning of the movement of the two occurrences of the catalyser *Event c*, which is extraneous to traditional scherzo or sonata form's temporal parameters, causes an increase of the frequency of events.

#### 4. The process of Narrativisation in Bars 166–379 (Development)

At the 'story' level, a process of gestural and semantical differentiation during the compositional process is particularly evident in the development section of the movement. This aspect is manifest in the addition of dynamic indications (in *Event b*), by the addition or replacement of motives (in *Event e*) and by the rendering of a given musical idea in a more homophonic texture (in *Event f*). *Event b*, in the SD the climax of bars 269–277, becomes a more gestural, emphatic idea compared to IV-FD8. In fact, on this early page there is no syncopation adopted in bars 269–270 of the SD, bar 269 is marked with *sf* instead

of *fff*, lacking the *fff* at bar 277 and the crescendo at bars 266–267 (circles in Ex. 6.18, II, 143).

Mahler cancelled the first occurrence of *Event e* (bars 166–173) on the earliest page IV-FD6 (Ex. 6.22, II, 146, version 1), probably because it is not differentiated from the ensuing scherzo, considering the use of the octave leap of *Group a*, and motives from *Groups e* and *c*. It has the harmonic basis of *Event c* but not its melodic profile, so it is insufficient to recall the transitional function of that idea. To differentiate this event, Mahler deletes the octave-leap motive of *Group a* in the following sketch of the same occurrence of *Event e*, on the same page (IV-FD6: Ex. 6.22, II, 146, version 2). He also adds the characteristic descending motive of the motto of *Group b* to the basis of *Event c*, already written in the cancelled previous sketch. These preparatory materials suggest that Mahler conceived the idea in homophonic terms and then added motives to the harmonic basis, similar to *Event c* and *Event d*.

By contrast, *Event f* (bars 287–311) acquired its homophonic identity during the compositional process. So, given the chronology of this idea (Table 6.4, II, 136), it is clear that from IV to the SD the idea was made more homophonic at bars 287–290 (marked with squares in Exs. 6.23, II, 147; 6.26, II, 150; 6.30, II, 154). The above-described process of gesturalisation in these changes makes the sections semantically distinct, especially for occurrences of *Event d* and *Event e*. In fact, after a difficult working-out during the compositional process, these ideas achieve their differentiated semantic quality of incidental suspensions—what I have called, respectively, ‘magical’ and ‘optimistically waiting for something to happen’. It is at the ‘discourse’ level, though, that a stronger process of narrativisation is detectable. At the last compositional stage, the movement’s basic musical ideas acquire comparability with Barthesian narrative functions—in addition to the status of morpho-syntactic and semantically autonomous events. *Event a* and *Event b* in their earliest



versions already have a gestural and morpho-syntactic definition which makes them Barthesian ‘nuclei’. Along these lines, one could also cite the evolution during the compositional process of *Event b* at bars 269–277 (Ex. 6.18, II, 143).

In the occurrence of *Event e* at bars 166–173 (Ex. 6.22, II, 146), the interchangeability of motives of *Events a, b* and *c* verifies Mahler’s purpose in building a section with a transitional and recapitulatory character. In the first cancelled sketch of IV-FD6 (Ex. 6.22, II, 146, version 1), the section looks back to the preceding *Event b* and *Event a* by using their characteristic motives. Then in the other sketch on the same page (Ex. 6.22, II, 146, version 2), Mahler added *Group b* motives from *Event c*’s motto–refrain in an attempt to induce in the listener a sense of ‘waiting’—waiting for the restatement of *Event a*, whose previous occurrences were always preceded by that motto. This section is thus also a catalyser, given that in the draft of the last compositional stage this idea anticipates, by that motto, the first theme, which restarts after this occurrence. With regard to *Event f* (Exs. 6.23, II, 147; 6.26, II, 150; 6.30, II, 154), making bars 287–290 of the SD more homophonic compared to the FD indicates Mahler’s intention to detach this section (as well as the occurrences of *Event d* and *Event e*) from the discursive planes of the two themes by homophonic writing. This also makes this section a Barthesian catalyser, so that in the SD it leads the ‘discourse’ of the alternation of two nuclei (*Event a* and *Event b*) astray.

The surviving preparatory materials invite us to develop another kind of discussion, which further confirms the existence of Mahler’s compositional narrative strategy in defining these musical ideas. Within these materials, they appear to function within a teleological and narrative plan that is different from that determined by conventional formal–tonal schemata. From this point of view, in the manuscript material chronologically preceding the last compositional stage, and on the basis of the compositional chronology of Chapter Two we can detect three versions of bars 174–311. The first version (Table 6.5, II,

155) is on IV-FD2, where bars 174–180 of *Event a* (Ex. 6.25, II, 149) were followed by the earliest version of bars 286–311 of *Event f* (Ex. 6.26, II, 150). Given their morphological features—the gestural definition of *Event a* and the melodic and rhythmic stasis of *Event f*—these sections work as a nucleus and a catalyser, respectively.

The second version of bars 174–311 (Table 6.6, II, 155) comprises three pages, IV-FD6–IV-FD7, and the cancelled upper part of IV-FD8. This version includes an E major section that was discarded on IV-FD7, bars 233 a–h (Ex. 6.27, II, 151). In my opinion, this discarded section had the autonomous function of a Barthesian catalyser, because it seems to lead the discourse astray. Moreover, these discarded bars are preceded by *Event e*, bars 226–233 (Ex. 6.29, II, 153). On IV-FD8, the cancelled upper part presents the occurrence of *Event d* of bars 244–247 (Ex. 6.20, II, 145), juxtaposed with *Event f* (bars 287–311; Ex. 6.23, II, 147), whereas in the last compositional version these two sections are far apart, separated by 40 bars. Also, given their morphological features (the tonal uncertainty of *Event d*, the harmonically suspensive nature of *Event f*), both ideas qualify as catalysers. Probably two juxtapositions of two ideas having the same parenthetic syntactic role in the FD would have seemed to Mahler to contrast with a basic fictive balance that prohibits the sequence of two catalysers. It is likely that for this reason, Mahler discarded the section in bars 233 a–h (Ex. 6.27, II, 151) and cancelled the entire sequence of *Events d + f* on this page.

The third version (Table 6.7, II, 156) departs from Mahler’s deletion of IV-FD8’s upper part, and its replacement with this page’s lower part that includes *Event d*, bars 244–247 and *Event b*, bars 248–282. Then there is page IV-FD9, with *Event b*, bars 283–286, and again a discarded section (Ex. 6.28, II, 152, bars 286 a–d), ascribable to *Event d*, and *Event f*, bars 287–311. Both of these sections (*Event d* and *Event f*) are catalysers; this sequence of catalysers might also have seemed to Mahler to be discursively unacceptable, according to the above-mentioned narrative balance he was evidently following. For this reason, he

probably discarded the section at bars 286 a–d. The choice of the key signature of E major for the cancelled bars of IV-FD7 (Ex. 6.27, II, 151) in the first version supports my suspicion that with those discarded bars, Mahler was creating a catalyser, connoted by a ‘digressive’ new key (like *Event d*, bars 244–247), between the two themes (*Event b*, bars 219–225 and *Event a*, bars 234–243). Further support for this inference comes from the fact that on page IV-FD8, bars 244–247 (Table 6. 6, II, 155, in blue; Ex. 6.21, II, 145), *Event d*—first written in A minor on IV-FD7 (Table 6.6, II, 155, in green; Ex. 6.19, II, 144)—has shifted to E major, the same key as the aborted seven-bar section of IV-FD7 (Table 6.6, II, 155, in blue; Ex. 6.27, II, 151).

The additive insertion of events during the compositional process determines an increase of the duration, frequency and speed of all events. In the second and third versions, it is clear that Mahler inserted other events between *Event a* (bars 174–80) and *Event f* (bars 287–311)—which are juxtaposed on IV-FD2 in the first version. Moreover, in the third version Mahler adds events between the occurrence of *Event d*, bars 244–247, and *Event f*, bars 287–311—which are juxtaposed in the upper part of IV-FD8 in the second version.

Concerning the possible changes to the order borrowed from traditional schemata or established at the beginning of the movement, during the compositional process there is no inversion but rather an addition of events. In other words, in versions 1 and 2, Mahler is like a novelist who uses a few words to relate events covering a long time-span. Mahler realised that many things between the two pairs of events of IV-FD2 needed to be told. But during the evolution of this passage a key role is played by *Event f*, which is used in bar 287 of the IV-SD7 to stop the resumption of *Event b* at bars 278–286, after the climax of bars 269–277. In the first two early versions, the discursive teleology does not valorise the interruptive role induced by *Event f*’s homophonic writing, contrasting with that of the two themes. Things are different in the third version, where, in the lower part of IV-FD8 (Ex. 6.18, II, 143),

Mahler writes the semantically non-autonomous climax (which is a part of *Event b*) of bars 269–277, so that finally, on IV-FD9, *Event f* can play a role in stopping the resumption of *Event b*. Probably in consideration of this, in the last compositional stage he decided to change the key of *Event a*'s return (bars 312–379) from E major to A major, taken from *Event b*, bars 248–277.

## 5. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 380–522 (Recapitulation)

Compared to the exposition and development, in the recapitulation there are fewer changes during the genesis of the section. Also here, however, significant clues to a process of narrativisation are observable. At Micznik's 'story' level a process of adding new motives is detectable during the compositional process. As in the exposition and the development, this aspect increases the degree of narrativity of the section and, ultimately, the semantic definition and autonomy of basic music ideas, which become comparable to narrative events. If this process of adding new motives involves almost all of the movement's basic ideas, then their early genetic versions reveal two kinds of starting points for this process.

Some of the ideas—*Events c, d, g* and *h*—were conceived in a homophonic way, and others—the two themes *Event a* and *Event b*—were conceived melodically. Thus, in the earliest version, on IV-FD13, bars 380–383 (Ex. 6.31, II, 157), *Event c* is conceived of in a homophonic way, with the harmonic basis already used for previous occurrences in the movement, and melodically presents only a *Group c* motive. The second version of these idea in the SD, on page IV-SD9, shows a more complex melodic profile, with motives from *Groups a, b* and *c*. In the third version of this idea, in the SD, on page IV-SD10, this melodic profile is simplified. If the motives change during the compositional process, then the harmonic basis remains the same, confirming its homophonic identity and its degree of strong gestural differentiation from *Event a* and *Event b*. Again, this purpose is confirmed

by the separation of these ideas with a double bar (without a change of a key signature) at the end of bar 383 of the second version on IV-SD9 (Ex. 6.31, II, 157). In *Event g*, bars 432–444 (Ex. 6.32, II, 158) on the FD page IV-FD14, there are no *Group d* motives (indicated with circles in Ex. 6.32), which I defined earlier as ‘nervous’, and are present in the SD on IV-SD11, Ex. 6.32 II, 158). *Event g* thus seems to originate in a homophonic idea, with the clear purpose of detaching it from the more ‘figural’ ideas in *Event a* and *Event b*. What is even more interesting is the genesis of the interrupting *Event h*, bars 505–516 (Ex. 6.33, II, 159). Here, IV-FD14 lacks the gestural definition and *Group d* motives, indicated with circles 1 and 2 in Ex. 6.33, but it seems more clearly conceived in a homophonic way. In addition, the intertextual superscription ‘*Orgelpunkt*’ (‘organ pedal point’, circle 3, Ex. 6.33) at bar 505 supports the idea of the homophonic genesis of this climax (again, in contrast to the melodic nature of the two themes).

The occurrences of *Event a* and *Event b* are from the beginning conceived in their essentially melodic profile, which occasionally changes across genetic versions by addition of some motives. It happens for *Event a*’s occurrence on page IV-FD14 (see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, pp. 119–120), where bars 444–450 in a rudimentary form lack *Groups b* and *c* motives. The insertion of a part (bars 458–477) of the section I defined as ‘cantabile’ and ‘construction of telling’ in this occurrence in the SD (see the transcription in Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, pp. 120–121) is significant. This plays a role in the last reminiscence of a thematically fluent discourse (see Section 6) in a context always more fragmented.

As stated above, *Event d*, *Event e*, *Event g* and *Event h* were conceived of in a homophonic way, while *Event a* and *Event b* were conceived of melodically. These two kinds of conception probably denote Mahler’s purpose, detectable at a ‘discourse’ level, to differentiate through a narrative teleology the respective narrative functions of the two

themes (*Event a* and *Event b*) from the other musical ideas.

Concerning narrative functions, the ‘genetic’ analysis of *Event a* and *Event b* testifies to the composer’s purpose during the compositional process to strengthen their status as Barthesian nuclei by a melodic and thematic continuity borrowed from traditional conventions. With this purpose, what happens in the SD at bars 460–477 is significant (see Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2017, p. 121). Here, as also happened in the exposition on IV-FD5, almost all of the ‘cantabile’ section is added in a revision to cover the insertion sign of the earlier page, IV-FD14. Also, it seems beyond doubt here that this addition enhances the melodic fluidity and the thematic continuity of this part of the movement to construct the ‘telling’.

The genesis of *Event c* and the two climaxes, *Events g* and *h* (and also of the occurrence of *Event d*, which changes little during the compositional process) confirms their disruptive, incidental and formally non-traditional narrative status as catalysers. But the most interesting observation is related to the discarding of bars 397 a–h on page IV-SD10 (Ex. 6.34, II, 160). In these discarded bars, the motive of the motto of *Event c* (but without its harmonic basis) confers on the section the transitional role of a supplementary catalyser. Its cancellation seems to indicate Mahler’s realisation that its discursive position was wrong, given the presence of another catalyser, *Event d* of bars 398–409 (Ex. 6.35, II, 160–161), which would be adjacent to it if these bars were not discarded. Here again, Mahler probably wanted to avoid a sequence of two catalysers having the authorial function of connecting ‘nuclei’. The juxtaposition of two catalysers would have reduced the fluidity of the ‘narration’ at a moment in which the movement must move, without hesitation or intrusions by the narrator, towards the bare, skeletal timbres of drums of the movement’s tragic epilogue.

## 6. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the Fourth Movement

Compared to the other movements of the Tenth Symphony, the fourth movement is simultaneously the least complete and the one whose highly contrasting musical gestures depict the most vividly dramatic plot. The ‘characters’ of this plot seems to be the two themes, *Event a* and its alter ego *Event b*. Between them, these two conflicting faces of the musical self engage in a challenge that ends in the death of both. After the exposition’s two initial presentations of these events, in the development and recapitulation they contrast in their alternation. So, the occurrence of *Event a* at bars 312–379 in strophe IV then ‘steals’ the A major key from the previous presentation of *Event b*’s occurrence at bars 248–277, which, according to Coburn (2002, p. 230), is disruptive and incomplete. *Event a*, then, with its climax at bar 377, triumphantly celebrates its (illusory) victory over its annihilated rival, which is absent in this strophe (strophe IV). At bar 278, however, *Event b* attempts to resume but is stopped by the suspensive *Event f*. From this point a ‘revenge’ of this musical idea begins, presented alone at bars 517–548 and 549–578, not paired with *Event a*. During the recapitulation, this event is disarticulated and disempowered; it loses bits of itself, shortens its duration, and is even ‘infected’ by *Event b*’s waltz accompaniment at bar 450. But despite its ‘victory’, *Event b* loses more and more energy in the recapitulation, until the death-march ‘noise music’ coda finishes with a drum-stroke.

Thanks to the force of secondary parameters, much more than in other movements, the gestural contrasts of these musical ideas make its signification resemble the greater precision of verbal narrative. The above plot of the struggle between *Event a* and *Event b*, of the triumph of the latter of and its final perishing, thus seems more intelligible and identifiable than that of other movements and somewhat ‘visible’ in an almost theatrical vividness, perhaps without the help of intertextual analysis—though intertextual analysis further confirms this understanding. The final stroke of a ‘*vollständige gedämpfte Trommel*’ (a

‘completely dampened drum’) is the final act not only of a lugubrious death march of the coda, but it also represents what can be defined in narratological terms as the ‘closed ending’ of a strongly teleological movement.

According to Adorno, this kind of dramatic closed ending in Mahler’s music ‘cannot be reconciled with the epic ideal of a music open in time’ (1960/1992, p. 101). As such, the end *par excellence*—Death—is represented in its most striking detail: the bare, skeletal timbre of a drum. This teleology is further enhanced by the pathway of a progressive tonality that starts in E major and by the end of the movement has fallen through other keys to D minor, one tone lower. Then, with these horrific musical images the listener has the impression that in the movement the death is not ‘told’ on the pages of a novel but ‘represented’ theatrically.

The teleology of the destiny of this poor ‘musical self’, then, seems to make the movement the most *finished*, in the sense of its closed ending in the death of the ‘protagonist’—in spite of the strong unfinishedness of the last compositional manuscript draft. In its theatrical, gestural vividness, the movement also seems the most ‘objective’ of the Symphony, especially in the coda, which is almost completely without catalysers that can ‘comment’ subjectively on the action. The Symphony could finish here, tragically and with a break of (life and musical) continuity. According to an autobiographical reading suggested by the literature on the *Tenth*, Mahler was desperate about Alma’s betrayal and so thought to confer on this movement the role of conclusion, as testified by the cancelled word ‘finale’ on the title page of the manuscript of the last compositional stage’s draft.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Jongbloed (1991, p. 147), by analysing provisional scores and verbal insertions, assumes that Mahler composed movements I, IV and II (in this order) and then twice changed the performative order between IV and II, considering both as the last movement of the Symphony, as suggested by their subtitle ‘Finale’ on IV-SD1. Although Jongbloed’s order of composition is disproved by Rothkamm’s more credible proposal (2003, pp. 30–60; see chapter two, section 5), it seems certain that, as Jongbloed supposes, Mahler, under the pressure



Later, things went differently for Mahler, who composed the fifth movement in a more serene mood after his reconciliation with Alma, probably inducing him to finish it with what seems an open ending: a hopeful continuation of music (and life) after the Symphony (as I will show in Chapter Seven). Not incidentally, the fifth movement continues the ‘narrative’ of the fourth by beginning with the same death march of the latter. In this reading, one could think, however, that the decision not to end the Symphony with the fourth movement is all *outside* of the composition itself, in Mahler’s biographical circumstances. However, the necessity to *continue* the Symphony seems not only linked to autobiographical contingencies but is also inscribed in some of Mahler’s narrativising choices during the compositional process. To add more detail to this assertion, I will identify three key issues posed by the study of narrativity at two previous stages of my analysis.

The first key issue is that Mahler enhances the narrative dimension within this dramatic plot by creating or defining gesturally ‘causal connections’ during the compositional process. In other words, page by page Mahler adds musical elements (increasing the degree of narrativity of the movement) which make the listener understand the movement as ‘told’, not ‘represented’ theatrically in music. The beginning of the movement was thus conceived earlier, on IV-FD1 (Fig 6.1, II, 143), as a straightforward ‘mad dance’ without the catalyser *Event c*, bars 1–4, and also without the ‘internal refrain’ of bars 18–22. Like epic fixed formulas, *Event c* the ‘internal refrain’ seem to help the Genettian ‘intradiegetic narrator’ of the movement in telling or recalling his story.

Later in the movement, and during the compositional process, the progressive definition and gestural differentiation from other events of the catalysers become significant. This

---

of his marital crisis, provisionally considered the fourth movement as the finale of the Symphony. This proposal relies on more ‘programmatic’ and autobiographical justifications than that which considers the second movement to be the last movement.

happens when Mahler makes them more homophonic and tonally differentiated from the quasi-polyphonic texture of *Event a* and the melodic character of *Event b*. The sections that Mahler cancelled point to this: they are all catalysers that seem to have been discarded only because they were adjacent to other catalysers, and so would have impeded a narrative alternation of nuclei and catalysers. Here are the passages in question:

- on IV-FD7, bars 233 a–h (Ex. 6.27, II, 151);
- on IV-FD9, bars 286 a–d (Ex. 6.28, II, 152);
- on IV-SD10, bars 397 a–h (Ex. 6.34, II, 160).

In addition, during the compositional process Mahler attempted to counterbalance this theatrical plot with tonal changes that work as narrative digressions. For *Event a*, bars 312–379, there is the ‘agential’ ‘theft’ of the key of A major in the SD, by transposing from the E major of the FD, a key taken from bars 248–277 of *Event b*. Moreover, in this process of the narrativisation of the dramatic plot, an important role is assumed by the compositional chronology of the two sections I have defined as a ‘cantabile-construction of telling’ (bars 57–98 and 452–477).

This analysis of this chronology leads to the second key issue of my discussion: meta-referentiality, McCallum’s ‘process within product’ that was already seen in the first, second and third movements. At the level of the last compositional draft, these two sections are in fact isolated areas of fluent, uninterrupted and phraseologically quite regular melodies within the scherzo sections, which are otherwise characterised by an irregular and fragmentary ‘mad dance’ (Table 6.2, II, 130, 134). Two clues suggest that in both sections Mahler might have wanted to represent meta-referentially a process of ‘composing’ those melodies in the last compositional stage.

The first of the clues is that both passages are constructed with motives presented fragmentarily in the sections that precede them (bars 1–56 and 444–451, respectively: Rothkamm, 2003, pp. 172–174, and Table 6.2, II, 130, 134). The second clue is that the fluent, continuous melodies of the two passages are not conceived initially but in a later version. So bars 57–94 are absent on page IV-FD1, added only on the later page IV-FD5. Likewise, page IV-FD13 lacks the bars of one part of the section (bars 458–477), added in the SD. Because these ideas are conceived with inserts in a second version, in contrast to the conception of the preceding sections (at bars 1–56 and 444–451, respectively), it seems that these ideas were conceived with greater compositional difficulty, something also suggested by their more elaborated process of assembling fragmentary motives from preceding sections. It seems, then, that Mahler (intended as ‘implied author’, arising from my text analysis) may have wanted to represent in the SD the narrator’s effort to recount (or recall from an actual or imaginary memory). Ultimately, in the SD, this effort is marked by the assembling of the melodic fragments of the previous ‘mad dance’ sections to create those continuous melodies. In other words, as in the previous movements, the level of the writing process and that of its final (or provisional) outcome again tend to coincide; a ‘polite’, ‘complete’ melodic continuity is reached only by additions later in the compositional process. Further support of these clues can be found in the first of those melodies, in bars 57–98. In fact, considering the compositional chronology of the exposition, it seems that once Mahler found the fixed formula of *Event c*, by adding the internal refrain at bars 1–4 and 111–114 to represent his compositional effort, in later changes he can finally collect and fluently order the fragments of the initial 56 bars by inserting bars 57–99 on page IV-FD5.

A ‘scriptorial’ process can also be detected in this movement, aimed at representing meta-referentially in music a process of writing that presupposes an intradiegetic narrator who is recollecting or assembling fragmentary musical ideas. However, that process is less detailed

in this movement because there are no ‘temporal’ markers—for example, the ‘stuttering memory’ in the first movement—to affirm that those uninterrupted melodies are recalled from a ‘musical past’. Nonetheless, the value of the vocal continuity of these passages as a (difficult) recollection deserves to be considered, to identify an overall narrative interpretation of the movement. If Johnson (2011) speaks of Mahler’s strategies of ‘breaking of the voice’, then these passages need to be considered a way to construct the (voice’s) continuity as a strategy.

These last considerations lead us to the third key issue: the dialectic between the closure of drama and the openness of the epic. From one perspective, the aspects, mentioned above, of the teleological closure of drama are conveyed by the closed ending of the movement. From another, the openness (in the sense of a potential endlessness) of epics is detectable, characterised by ‘an almost infinitely expandable and contractible number [of events]’ (Herrnstein-Smith, 1968, p. 99). This interpretation is suggested by alternation of scherzo and trio themes but also, and above all, by the returning catalysers. Amongst them, *Event c* deserves particular mention. Like the *Group I* motives in the third movement, *Event c* is pervasive, but, unlike that musical idea, it also has a semantic autonomy that makes it an event. It is comparable to the likewise semantically autonomous idea—*Event x*—of the first movement; in the fourth movement, however, more catalysers counterbalance its gestural theatrical vividness, which exceeds that of *Event x*. Thus, as well as *Event c*, *Events d* and *e* also recur from time to time to push forward, lead astray or delay the ‘dramatic plot’ of the ‘struggle’ between the two themes. Instead, a significant support of the interpretation of the movement’s ending as closed rather than open comes from the aforementioned reduction of catalysers in the final part of the movement that is not ‘liberating’ as in the first or fifth movement. In other words, this thinning out does not seem to be the effect of reconciling the thematic oppositional contrasts between the two themes, but rather, of the intensifying

of their gestural contrast in the development. The gestural eloquence of the extinguishing of the ‘musical self’ in the ‘noise music’ coda—the movement’s most vivid gesture—seems to be the emblem of the prevailing of the theatrical teleology over the potentially unfinished continuity of the epic.

Finally, the discussion on the three key issues above suggests the existence, behind the movement’s process of narrativisation, of an overall communicative intention by the ‘implied author’, who arises from the ‘intention of text’ within the existing compositional material.<sup>103</sup> The movement’s incomplete manuscript comprises two DSSs: two versions of what it is usually considered the first stage of Mahler’s compositional process.<sup>104</sup> The two existing DSSs seem to have launched a process of narrativisation of early versions destined to continue in an SS – or, in any case, in an OD. To support this claim, I mention the process of narrativisation already evident in the existing materials. I point to the narrativising revisions made during the compositional process: for example, the later additions of *Event c* (bars 1–4), the ‘internal refrain’ (bars 18–22). Then, as a further aspect leading me to prefigure this continuation of the compositional process, I mention the two sections I label ‘cantabile–construction of telling’ (57–98 and 452–477), both conceived as later insertions to previous versions. Like the two themes of the first movement, *Events d(c)1–2* of the second movement, and the *Erntelied Event* in the third, these melodic sections open and close worlds of melodic continuity. These musical ideas need to unfold more fluently to overcome the paroxysmal and painful *Weltlauf*, which *Event a*’s mad dance also comes from. However, the tension determined by these added materials can be completely released only with the ‘melody’ of the fifth movement (mentioned in the poem no. 329, in GMAB, 2004,

---

<sup>103</sup> The definitions of Eco’s concepts of ‘implied author’, ‘empirical author’ and ‘intention of text’ are explained in Chapter One, section 3, p. 26.

<sup>104</sup> Mahler’s standard compositional process is presented in Chapter Two, section 2.

p. 377).

Ultimately these textual pieces of evidence reveal that the overall narrative intention of the 'implied author' seems to consist in changing, across the compositional process, the direct discourse of the dramatic gestural plot of the movement into an Adornian narrative indirect musical discourse. If so, then the conclusion of the Symphony with this Scherzo, and the theatrical features of its early versions, would not be imposed by the overall narrative teleology of the Symphony that he was constructing. Instead, these theatrical textual aspects would be the expression of a Freudian 'impossibility to love and work' of the 'empirical author' (a suffering represented by the bare rhythmic skeleton in the 'noise music' coda), not the redemption the 'implied author' was seeking throughout the previous movements. Just this searching, then, seems to have led the composer both to narrativise the early materials and to finish the Symphony with another movement.

# Chapter Seven. Narrativity and Narrativisation in the Fifth Movement<sup>105</sup>

My analytical enterprise ends in this chapter, with the analysis of the last movement of the Tenth Symphony. In sections 1 and 2, at the first stage of my apparatus, I will analyse the draft of the last compositional stage, a short score in bifolios. In section 3, at the second stage of my analytical apparatus, I will consider the only existing preparatory materials, the loose-sheet pages V-SS10, V-SS8 and V-SS14. Then, in section 4, I will attempt an overall narrative interpretation of the movement.

The ‘genetic’ analysis of narrativity sheds light on the peculiarity that distinguishes this movement from the others: its function of Adornian *Erfüllung* (fulfilment) of the entire Symphony. Thus, in this movement, the melodic and gestural continuity to which the previous movements aspired is finally (if with difficulty) achieved with the long-extended melody constructed from Alma’s ‘Erntelied’ motive presented fragmentarily in the third movement. In this way, Mahler once again seems to want to represent a process of writing, in a meta-referential play between an ‘inside’ and an ‘outside’ of his mental ‘composing hut’.

## 1. The Analysis of the ‘Story’ Level

At the paradigmatic ‘story’ level there is a great gestural contrast between basic musical ideas. For this reason, and because of their semantic autonomy, these musical ideas seem

---

<sup>105</sup> An earlier version of this chapter was published as Pinto (2019).

comparable with narrative events. Like the second, third and fourth movements, the fifth also has a strong motivic–thematic hybridity, a feature that enhances the narrative individuality and autonomy of materials. As in those movements, the basic musical ideas which can be compared to narrative events have a significant number of common (morpho-syntactically and semantically not autonomous) basic motives. Because of this hybridity, the motivic–thematic identity of every ‘narrative event’ is conveyed by the prevalence of one of the motives that is also present in other ‘narrative events’. The peculiar distinction of this movement, however, is that these basic non-autonomous motives are entirely borrowed from other movements. According to Rothkamm (2003, pp. 187–188), these motives can be arranged into nine motive groups, labelled by him as ‘II’, ‘d’, ‘IV’, ‘AII’, ‘a’, ‘III’, ‘I’, ‘b’ and ‘AI’<sup>106</sup> (see Ex. 7.1, II, 163, which indicates the most important occurrences of these motive groups, and Table 7.1, II, 176–178;<sup>107</sup> from here on I label these groups with ‘Group(s)’ accompanied by the above numerals and letters used by Rothkamm). *Group IV*, borrowed from the third movement, derives from Alma’s song ‘Erntelied’. In this movement this *Group* assumes, in its insistent recurrence, particular structural importance in the management of materials. For this reason, in what follows I shall refer to the motives of this *Group* as the ‘*Erntelied motive*’, as a single entity. Those I label as ‘*Group j*’ (first occurrence at bar 53, Ex. 7.2, II, 164) and ‘*Group k*’ (first occurrence at bars 98–103, Ex. 7.3, II, 164) also assume strong structural importance.

The morpho-syntactic contrast mentioned above is particularly evident in the movement’s first part (bars 1–83), indicated by Mahler with the word ‘*Einleitung*’

---

<sup>106</sup> Each Rothkamm’s label is that which he assigned to the motive in the analysis of the previous movement in which it first appears.

<sup>107</sup> This table, like Tables 3.1 (II, 37–39), 4.1 (II, 77–79), 5.3 (II, 113–115), 6.2 (II, 130–135), presents my formal analysis of the movement in relation to those made by other scholars.



(‘introduction’). In fact, here there are two gesturally and semantically different musical ideas I call ‘*Event a*’ (first presented in bars 1–29, Ex. 7.4, II, 165) and ‘*Event b*’ (first presented in bars 30–71, Ex. 7.5, II, 166). *Event a* is non-thematic motive, seeming instead to be introductory (as is appropriate for an ‘*Einleitung*’) in its fragmentary, tentative musical gesture. For this reason, Coburn has called this section ‘cellular’ (Coburn, 2002, p. 236). The backbone of this event is given by secondary parameters of dynamics and timbre, by a sequence of *sf* drum strokes (bars 1, 9, 24) which are the continuation of the noise-music of the end of the fourth movement. The short motives from *Groups II* and *d* (Ex. 7.1, II, 163) of the third movement are also present in this event. In contrast with the event’s fragmentation, the more continuous *Erntelied* motive at bars 12–14,<sup>108</sup> 22–24 and 28–29 also appear within this section.

In contrast to *Event a*, the construction of *Event b*, with its prevalent *Erntelied* motive material, is thematic and fluent. Its backbone is given by the primary parameter of melody and its compositional materials display a higher degree of coordination between parameters. The phrasing tends to be regular, rests are rare, and the melodic gesture is continuous. Contrary to the uncertain gait of *Event a*, it seems to go ahead by itself, pushed teleologically by the *Erntelied* motive in its continuous refrain.<sup>109</sup> In other words, this motive behaves morphologically as one of Almén’s ‘agents’, which can be considered another important narrative aspect. These features of fluency and continuity are particularly present in the last and longest occurrence of this event (bars 299–400), which is also its most extended statement of the movement.

I call another basic musical, gesturally autonomous, idea ‘*Event c(a)*’ (first presented at bars 84–97, Ex. 7.6, II, 166). In the part of the manuscript marked ‘*Allegro Moderato*’, this

---

<sup>108</sup> From here on, to follow the analysis presented in this chapter, see Table 7.1, II, 176–178.

<sup>109</sup> Coburn (2002, pp. 240–49), has accurately described the structural function of this continuous refrain.

event exists morphologically at the halfway point between *Event a* and *Event b*. The prevalence of motives from *Groups II* and *d* seems to relate this idea to *Event a*. However, pairs consisting of cells belonging to these two *Groups* in this *Event c(a)* create recurring longer motives. *Event c(a)* is characterised by a rhythmically feverish continuous movement, which de La Grange (2008, p. 1523) defines as ‘a la Purgatorio’. Moreover, this event reveals its fragmentary life at every occurrence (bars 104, 121, 127, 152), because it is continually interrupted by ever longer occurrences of *Event b*. It is exactly this iterative reciprocal contrast which will become the backbone of the gestural plot of the movement.

The reference to other movements happens at the minute level of morphologically, semantically non-autonomous basic motives, and also at a level of entirely gesturally, semantically autonomous events imported from previous movements. In fact, part of the first movement’s climax *Event c2*, is quoted in this movement at bars 275–283 (Ex. 7.7, II, 167) in a section I call ‘*Event c2(V)*’. If in the first movement (bars 203–212) *Event c2* has a shapeless sound mass, here it is defined by the addition of the (still) fragmentary melodic ideas from *Groups d* and *II*. Another event borrowed from the first movement is the tonally ambiguous/chromatic *Event x*. Here it is presented in the form of two occurrences of what I call ‘*Event x(V)*’ framing the above climactic section: at bars 267–274 (Ex. 7.8, II, 168), a reference to bars 188–193 of the first movement, and at bars 284–298 (Ex. 7.9, II, 168), borrowing from bars 1–15 of the first movement.

As in other movements, smaller events play a special role in the unfolding of the movement, from the developmental ‘Allegro moderato’ onwards. Two distinct musical ideas that are morpho-syntactically and semantically autonomous occur within *Event b*: ‘*Event b1*’, bars 119–120, and ‘*Event b2*’, bars 125–126. Alongside the occurrence of *Event c(a)* at bars 121–124, *Event b1* and *Event b2* are quotations of bars 107–114 of ‘Purgatorio’ (Ex. 7.10, II, 170). Both *Event b1* and *Event b2* present a unique *Erntelied* motive, emphasised

by dynamics (*fff subito* and *ff*, respectively).

Other events are *Event d* (bars 175–190, Ex. 7.11, II, 171), *Event e* (bars 245–250, Ex. 7.12, II, 172) and *Event f* (bars 261–266, Ex. 7.13, II, 173). Each of these musical ideas performs a transitional syntactical function and is morphologically very hybridised, given the presence of motive groups prevalent in both *Event b* and *Event c(a)*. *Event d* is a build-up followed by a climax borrowed from the fourth movement (bars 432–436). In the last bars of *Event d* (bars 175–190), there is a significant repetition of the interval of a seventh —C–B flat) — (indicated in Ex. 7.11, II, 171, square 1) which precedes the new occurrence of *Event b* at bar 191. In this way Mahler makes the listeners expect the following *Event b* occurrence, because they have already heard this interval preceding the arrival of *Event b* at bars 29–30. In addition to being transitional, *Event e* is interruptive, abruptly interrupting the melody of *Event b* at bar 245. It uses motives of motive groups prevalent in both *Event b* and *Event c(a)* (*Groups k, b* and *II, d*, respectively). Again, in this section there are intervals of a seventh (Ex. 7.12, II, 172, square 1), as in *Event d*. Here, however, the return of *Event b* is elided, and what arrives instead is an occurrence of *Event c(a)* at bars 152–162. *Event f* is another build-up that leads to the climactic *Event x(V)* and uses motives from both *Event c(a)* and *Event b*, belonging to *Groups d* and *k*, respectively (see the unnumbered squares in Ex. 7.13, II, 173). A motive from *Group k* recurs twice at bars 261–264 and 265–266; the second occurrence is suddenly interrupted by the coming climactic section at bar 267.

A further aspect of the morphological evolution of the basic motives deserves particular focus here, to corroborate their narrative gestural autonomy. This aspect concerns the changes throughout the movement in the method of inserting semantically non-autonomous motives of *Groups j* and *k* and those belonging to *Groups b, d, II* and *III* into each theme in which they are not prevalent. In other words, I wish to shed light on the method of inserting

motives of *Groups d* (and, to a lesser extent, of *Groups II, III* and *b*), prevalent in *Event a* and *Event c(a)*, into *Event b*. But I also want to show how motives prevalent or structurally connected with *Event b*—the *Erntelied motive* and motives from *Groups j* and *k*—are inserted into *Event a* and *Event c(a)*.

In the expository section, *Group d* cells appear most frequently integrated gesturally in their fragmentary ‘natural environment’—the ‘cellular’ and introductory *Event a* separated by rests or longer notes emphasising their fragmentary status, or in *Event b* at bars 53–54 and 67. In the developmental section (bars 84–266), *Group d* cells, whose natural environment’ is *Event c(a)*, are inserted into *Event b* and are more often conjoined with *Group II* motives. These *Group d* cells are, however, separated by rests, and thus appear as a heterophonic disturbance out of context.<sup>110</sup> Only in the recapitulatory section (bars 299–400) are the numerous occurrences of these cells from *Group d* (bars 303, 347, 371, 374, 375, 386–389) integrated morphologically into the fluency of *Event b*. In the expository section, the *Erntelied motive* within the *Event a* is isolated by rests and so integrated into its fragmentary gesture. When *Group d* cells occur in the development section, the *Erntelied motive* appears gesturally fused (e.g., in bars 96–97) into this ‘nervous’ event because it is not separated by rests. In this part of the movement, then, the *Erntelied motive* does not disturb *Event c(a)* but rather irrupts outside of it, in the form of ever more continuous occurrences of *Event b*.

To sum up, motives from *Group d* integrate gesturally with occurrences of *Event b* in the exposition and recapitulation sections only, but not in the developmental section. By contrast, the *Erntelied motive* seems ‘cohesive’ and so is always integrated gesturally into *Event a* and *Event c(a)*—including in the development section. Given the above-identified morpho-

---

<sup>110</sup> ‘Inserting’ this disturbing motive to a pre-existent sketch in the added stave above the four-stave system of the SS (Fig. 7.1, II, 174, bar 201, in the circle) is a highly significant indicator of Mahler’s strategy.

syntactic autonomous musical ideas, in what follows I will demonstrate what makes them semantically autonomous, such that they can definitely be considered ‘narrative events’.

The terms ‘transfiguration’ and ‘redemption’ recur often in the literature on the Tenth Symphony and are used to explain the semantics of the movement. According to Rothkamm (2003, p. 193), the initial and repeated drum stroke is a key semantic factor of *Event a*. This musical idea, as noted above, is intended to be the continuation of the fourth movement’s ‘*vollständige gedämpfte Trommel*’ (‘completely dampened drum’) stroke. It is a representation of the funeral of that ‘musical self’ that died in the previous movement, a musical gesture that can be linked with the biographical episode of the funeral march of a fireman that Alma and Mahler observed from a hotel window in New York. In particular, according to Rothkamm (2003, p. 193), a musical representation of a funeral procession’s gait is detectable in the fragmented cells from *Groups d* and *II*. In light of what I have written about the introduction–refrain *Event x* of the first movement, this section is also ascribable to the conventional fragmentation of a symphony introduction (‘*Einleitung*’). However, another, more decisive, fictive continuation or *Erfüllung* of the ‘novel’ of the Symphony was sketched only in the third movement. In it, Alma’s ‘Erntelied’ motives appear like transient fragments. Here, finally, with the increasing fluency of occurrences of *Event b*, the musical story of the writing of that Lied is fully told and concluded by another hand—Mahler’s. The regret for having forbidden Alma’s composing becomes an homage to her, to her Lied—or, to be more precise, to her writing that Lied.

As in the second and fourth movements, the two main events, *Event a/c(a)* and *Event b* have motives in common for ‘hybridity’, which in this case makes the passage seem like a cinematic change of scene. Within the same ideal scenery depicted by music, Mahler goes

from ‘outwardness’, outside the window, to ‘inwardness’,<sup>111</sup> inside the window, to Alma’s image (to use the above biographical anecdote as a metaphor of music). This is the main semantic aspect of the movement (and perhaps of the Symphony)—that is, the melodic construction of *Event b*, the gradual construction and recalling of the long-lasting lyrical melody.<sup>112</sup> The relationship between these two dimensions is particularly complex. The ‘subjective’, more abstract inwardness—the musical self and its ‘abstract’ constructive dynamics—fall increasingly only on connotative–intertextual meanings: the reference to the *Erntelied* motive, to a topic of endless melody of Isolde’s *Liebestod* in the last occurrence of this theme (bars 299–400).<sup>113</sup> The ‘objective’ outwardness—the episode of the death of the musical self—uses something other than the intertextual reference to funeral music: kinetic and iconic–musical meanings, the pace of the funeral procession, the last breaths of the dying musical self (the *Erntelied* motive, bars 12–13 and 22–23). The inwardness here is more than an assimilation, as I read it by using Adorno’s terms (1960/1992, p. 50); instead, it teleologically overcomes the outwardness. From this viewpoint, the main feature of *Event b* in all its occurrences is that ‘continuity’ of Alma’s Lied, which in the third and fourth movement was impeded by the *Weltlauf*. The ‘lyrical melody’ (Rothkamm, 2003, p. 194) can then be a further specifying of the semantics of *Event b*.

The transfiguration’s pathway from a suppressed to a recalled ‘subjectivity’<sup>114</sup> leads back to a well-known topic of constructing musical continuity from fragments, from Haydn’s *Creation* onwards. The sevenths of bar 29 bring the listener from the funereal darkness of *Event a* to the bright *Event b* at bar 30, and in their following occurrences they keep this role

---

<sup>111</sup> I have borrowed the concepts of ‘inwardness’ and ‘outwardness’ in Mahler’s music from Adorno, as used in his phrase I quoted on p. 117.

<sup>112</sup> ‘Revoking of melody’ is Johnson’s label for this theme (2009, p. 88).

<sup>113</sup> This intertextual reading of this finale is ascribable to Floros (1998, p. 256).

<sup>114</sup> ‘What is this incomparable flute melody if not a revocation of the negativity that had apparently all but silenced the lyrical voice and with it the subject?’ (Johnson, 2009, p. 88).

of announcing *Event b*. On their own, however, the occurrences of this event have an increasing duration until the longest melodic continuity of the entire Symphony, at the end of the movement (81 bars). Here, finally, this ‘endless melody’ not only increases its duration but also acquires completeness in directionality in a parabolic melodic pathway, with a climax at bar 352 (*‘grosser Ton’* is Mahler’s verbal indication at this bar in the manuscript). But where the completion of the Symphony seems to have been achieved, the final gesture of the coda outlines an ideal continuation of the Symphony after its final cadence. According to Johnson (2009, pp. 90–91), the empty fifths of bars 398–399 are comparable to the chiming of bells, which he considers ‘ubiquitous symbols, in Mahler’s music, of calling forth—of opening’ (Johnson, 2009, p. 92). He adds, ‘this is a closing, but a closing by the voice, not—as in the Sixth Symphony—of the voice’ (Johnson, 2009, p. 90). I add that that chiming of bells is preceded by the last occurrence of the *Erntelied* motive, so as in the Ninth and *Das Lied von der Erde*, this closure is really a non-closure. It is an incessant, unfinished composer’s voice that ideally can stop after the work he is composing, with the end of its creator’s life.

Less complex than *Event a* and *Event b* are the semantics of the other events of the movement. De La Grange (2008, p. 1523) defines *Event c(a)* as ‘a la Purgatorio’ to indicate its rhythmically incessant Purgatorio-like perpetuum mobile. It is because of this event that I use the Adornian term *Weltlauf*, which I used earlier for some ideas of other movements, in its function as the antagonist of *Event b*. *Event b1* and *Event b2* keep the semantic content they had in the Purgatorio, in terms of the intertextual reference to Alma’s *Erntelied*. *Event d*, *Event e* and *Event f* instead bear a generic character of ‘waiting’, because of their connective and recapitulatory syntactic function. Also remarkable in this movement are the semantic transformations of each ‘event’. Thus, for example, *Event b* at bars 145–152 and 163–174 manifests a harmonic stability that suggests a strength which could perhaps lead

back to Alma's assertive character, already honoured in a similar way in the first movement of the Sixth Symphony.

The importing of material from other movements (and especially from 'Purgatorio') may sometimes imply a modification of the previous semantic content, as if it were the evolution of a character in the 'story' told across the movements. So, for example, at bars 127–130 (in the square of Ex. 7.14, II, 175), we note the trill accompaniment of 'Purgatorio's bars 89–91, but with a chromaticism that corrupts the childlike innocence of that 'carousel' music (Ex. 7.14, II, 175, in the oval). *Event x* of the first movement is also imported in this movement as *Event x(V)*. It has two occurrences, at bars 267–274 and 284–298 (Exs. 7.8 and 7.9, II, 168–169), before (as in that movement) and after the climax, likewise borrowed from the first movement, at bars 275–283 (Ex. 7.7, II, 167), which I label *Event c2(V)*. In the occurrence of *Event x(V)* at bars 267–274, *Event x* of the first movement is 'temporalised' and gesturally included in the climax with a clear key of F sharp major instead of the tonal ambiguity /chromaticism of the corresponding bars 183–193 of the first movement, where *Event x* is gesturally outside the climax. Where in the first movement, *Event x* was present only in *Event c2* (bars 203–206) of the climax, the trumpet note A (Alma's initial, mentioned by Rothkamm, 2003, p. 108) is superimposed on *Event x(V)*. The listener already knows from the previous movement what happened after this section, so in this new occurrence the note works as a presentiment of a repetition of that catastrophe. The second occurrence of *Event x(V)* (Ex. 7.9, II, 168–169), unlike the first one, is integrally borrowed from the first movement and keeps the meta-referential function it had in the first movement before the climax (bars 183–193). In fact, here it serves as the collection of all the basic cells of the Symphony (see Chapter Three, p. 78) before the liberating effort of the finale of the movement. The climax of the first movement is also significantly modified semantically. The rapid figures mentioned by Rothkamm (see Chapter Two p. 69), compared with the



corresponding climax passage of the first movement, make *Event x(V)* more gesturally concrete. In this way, then, it seems to depict a vivid fragment of reality that had been in the shadow of the sound mass of the first movement. The passage is thus made more similar to the referentiality of the events of verbal narrativity, although without their denotative precision.

In the end, particular attention must be paid to the heterophonic coexistence within the same event of musical elements which, because of their gestural diversity, can lead back in different ways, as examples of Bakhtinian novelistic polyphony. This happens at the occurrences of *Event d* (bars 185–186) and *Event b* (bars 197–198 and 220). Here the semantic content, de La Grange (2008, p. 1527) defined ‘notes of derision’, coexists with the main contents of those sections I have labelled ‘waiting’ (*Event d*) and ‘*Erntelied* melody’ (*Event b*), respectively.

## 2. The Analysis of the ‘Discourse’ Level

The unfolding of the events in this movement shows a narrative logic that differs from conventional formal canons. Sonata form leaves ‘archaeological’ traces in the last compositional stage like ‘ruins from which [Mahler’s music] architecture is piled up, much as Norman master builders in southern Italy may have made use of Doric columns’, to use Adorno’s beautiful metaphorical expression (1960/1992, p. 67). It is, however, quite difficult to find these traces, as Coburn (2002, p. 274) points out, and thus there is debate in the literature on the form of the movement. The elements that favour ascribing the label ‘sonata form’ are: thematic dualism of *Event a* and *Event b* (Rothkamm, 2003, p. 192); the position of the climax, comparable to that of the first movement (Rothkamm, 2003, p. 192); the formal resemblance to the first movement, already labelled a sonata form (Coburn, 2002, p. 274); and the developmental nature of the second part (bars 84–266; Coburn, 2002, p.

274). I add to these features that the movement has a tripartite form. The contrary elements are: a developmental section (bars 184–285) that introduces new motives (Rothkamm, 2003, p. 193); the repetition only of *Event b* in the recapitulatory section (bars 299–400; Rothkamm, 2003, p. 193); and Mahler’s enigmatic labelling of the possible sonata form exposition (bars 1–83) as ‘*Einleitung*’, ‘introduction’ (Rothkamm, 2003, pp. 192–193).

My perspective, however, is different from that of these authors. As I discussed with the previous movements, I ask if the sonata form or other traditional, reified schemata served as a starting or reference point during the compositional process. From my point of view, then, the elements in favour, listed above, can be assumed to support this formal reference function in the movement’s compositional process. The contrary elements, on the other hand, can be considered as clues, to be supported further by this analysis, to a possible process of narrativisation during the compositional process. From this point of view, the huge departures from the sonata form schema in the movement seem a gestural plot that doubles or replaces the conventionalised tonal plot. The main trace of this gestural plot is in Mahler’s placing of the indication ‘*Einleitung*’ (‘introduction’) at the beginning of the movement, probably referring to the entire first part until bar 83. The literature on Mahler’s Tenth has not yet found a convincing explanation for this title. The indication is enigmatic not so much because it includes the entire expository section with both putative themes (*Event a* and *Event b*), instead of referring to a proper introductory movement (like an introductory Adagio of a symphony), but rather, because although the supposed first theme, *Event a*, can be considered morpho-syntactically introductory due to its cellular fragmentation. However, from the point of view of semantics, as above, *Event a* is anything but introductory. It is, rather, the continuation of the tragic epilogue of a ‘story’ (of the ‘musical self’/fireman), which has begun to be told in the previous movement. Although the ‘*Einleitung*’ also includes *Event b* from bar 30, it cannot be morpho-syntactically introductory because it is

thematically fluent and because it becomes a protagonist during the movement. Rather, *Event b* is the musical idea introduced by *Event a*.

By using the autobiographical episode of the fireman as a metaphor, I can say that the dramatic fragmentariness of *Event a* seems to be represented by the vivid scene, described by Alma (AME, 1940/1946, p. 175), of the fireman's funeral that she and Mahler observed from the window of the hotel in New York. The meaning of this word '*Einleitung*', therefore, should be not read in the technical sense of a classical slow introductory section in a sonata form movement. Instead, this indication can be explained in terms of a fictive presentation of a 'prologue'—the presentation of two 'characters' (*Event a* and *Event b*)—of an intrigue which will be developed in the '*Allegro moderato*', the putative developmental section (bars 84–266). Using Johnson's terms (2009, p. 88), I would say that the intrigue of the movement—and, on a larger, symphony-wide scale—is the gradual construction and recalling of the subjecting voice.

This 'subjecting voice'—*Event b*—is introduced in the *Einleitung* by its antagonist—*Event a*—who seems, in the central '*Allegro moderato*' under the guise of *Event c(a)*—to offer a severe challenge to *Event b*. There follows the catastrophe of the climax and *Event x(V)*, which functions as a meta-referential recollection of ideas, before the liberating effort of the final part of the movement. Here we note the longer, more fluent occurrence of *Event b* and the disappearance of *Event a* and *Event c(a)*, whose main *Group d* motive is completely integrated into *Event b*. *Event b* and *Event c(a)* therefore seem to represent two very different worlds: the good (*Event b*) and the evil (*Event a/c(a)*) of the Symphony. There is the increasing continuity of Alma's voice stylised in the Lied, as recomposed by Mahler and represented by the cohesive *Erntelied* motive; and there is the disturbing motives (belonging to *Groups d* and *II*) of *Event a*. From another perspective, however, the common motives between *Event b*, *Event a* and *Event c(a)* imply that the latter is not completely

externalised outside of the musical self. Rather, in *Event a*, that vivid image in the music of ‘musical self’/fireman’s funeral establishes an ‘objective’ distance of telling.

In this narrative plot, a particular role is played by epic-like fixed formulas,<sup>115</sup> by a massive use of refrains across the movement. As with the first movement of the Ninth, according to Micznik’s analysis, these refrains ‘gain a sense of invocation, [and work] together with the improvisatory, oral-tradition quality of theme and with the past-oriented connotations of the materials, suggesting the pastness of events’ (Micznik, 2001, p. 224). This happens not only at a global level a strophic returning of events (see below), but also at the local level of the ubiquitous return of cells and *Group d* and *II* and, especially, of the *Erntelied* motive, whose structural importance has been thoroughly identified by Coburn (2002, pp. 243–256).

In contrast to other movements, however, the temporal, diegetic excursions are weaker (see, for example, the ‘present’ of the tonally ambiguous/chromatic *Event x* in the first movement, versus the ‘past-oriented’ and nostalgic diatonic *Event a*). Instead, a likeness to a past-oriented narrative is indirectly provided by this refrain. It not only responds to structural need, as indicated by Coburn (2002, pp. 243–256), but as in the first movement it also fulfils a paratactic (meta-referential) function of a stylised composer’s compositional difficulty in recollecting ideas to finish the movement and the Symphony. This process culminates in the quotation at bars 284–298 of *Event x* of the first movement, containing all the basic cells and motives of the Symphony. At a more global level, this paratactic function is provided by a strophic construction articulated by the more or less regular, cyclic returning of events (Table 7.1, II, 176–178). The returns of basic musical ideas, however, are here more complex than in the previous movements and in the first movement of the Ninth, as

---

<sup>115</sup> See Barbara Herrnstein Smith (1968, p. 99).

analysed by Micznik (2001). There are three themes in that movement, but the third one is inserted into the strophic cycles given by the return of the first two themes. In this movement, however, from the beginning of the 'Allegro moderato' onwards, *Event c(a)* replaces, in the recurring of strophes, *Event a*, from which it morphologically originates.

Having identified the narrative plot of the movement, it is now necessary to find its possible narrative features identified according to the discursive parameters considered by my apparatus: narrative functions, gestural connotations and temporal discursive parameters (duration, frequency, speed and order). In terms of narrative functions, *Event a/Event c(a)* and *Event b* can be considered as Barthesian nuclei. This function is achieved by their strong gestural definition, their cyclic and quite regular return, and the fact that they have an agential role of a gestural plot in the 'epic' of Mahler's symphonic gesture. Likewise, *Event c2(V)* (climax), bars 275–283, maintains and even strengthens its function as a nucleus of the corresponding section c2 in the first movement. The first and second occurrences (bars 267–284 and 284–298) of *Event x(V)* certainly work as catalysers, similar to *Event x* in the first movement. More complex is the identification of the narrative function of motives *Events b1, b2, d, e* and *f*. At a discursive level, all of these occurrences have an incidental, connective function that is different to the primary one of providing iterative contrasts with *Event c(a)* and *Event b* in the development section. Certainly, they are quantifiable as catalysers, but not in the same way. *Event b1* and *Event b2* are part of the quotation of the third movement's bars 107–114, including the section of bars 121–124, which is a further occurrence of *Event c(a)*. Because of their brief duration, they do not have the capability (contrary to the longer, fluent occurrences of *Event b*) to 'oppose' *Event c(a)*. Rather, as in that movement, they lead the *Weltlauf* pathway of the occurrence of *Event c(a)* astray before and after them (bars 104–118 and 127–144). A different shade of the catalyser function is seen in *Event d* (bars 175–190), *Event e* (bars 245–250) and *Event f* (bars 261–266), and a

particular role is played by the *Erntelied* motive and motive *Group k* in them. These sections occur after the iterative contrast of *Event c(a)* and *Event b* has just been established (bars 84–174), accompanying, in a connective function, the ‘oppositional’ plot between *Event a* and *Event c(a)*. These sections—*Event d*, *Event e* and *Event f*—then, constitute an alternative discursive level. Given their hybridity, they assume a recapitulatory and transitional function. In Barthesian terms, they accelerate, delay, give fresh impetus to the discourse, summarise and anticipate. In addition, these three events contain motives characteristic of *Event a/Event c(a)* and *Event b*, and for this reason they fill in the narrative space that would otherwise be quite large between the nuclei—*Event a* and *Event b*. It is significant that motive *k* and the *Erntelied* motive assume Almén’s agential/actantial role in these events.

In these three events, those motives (structurally connected with *Event b*) are presented in incomplete forms, thus causing in the listener the expectation of a complete occurrence of *Event b*. However, it is the addition of these anticipatory motives that makes those events catalysers, where otherwise they would be mere occurrences of nuclei *Event a* or *Event c(a)*.

As far as gestural connotations are concerned, it is evident that Mahler employs a strategy of avoiding a conventional tonal plot, and that the movement’s formal articulation is conveyed through gestural changes. Thus, the passage between the first occurrence of *Event a* and that of *Event b* apparently follows a conventional tonal plot from the starting key, D minor, to its parallel major key, D major. But careful observation of *Event b*’s tonal trajectory reveals that, really, this is not the only key to connote this event tonally. In fact, in *Event b* this key is soon left behind for a harmonic round: B major (bars 44–58), D major (bars 59–65) and B major (bars 66–71). The long duration of *Event b* corresponds to a tonal

pathway without a ‘polar’ key return, with a ‘solar’ function of the key of D major.<sup>116</sup> Again, the following articulation between *Event b* and *Event a* (bars 71–72) happens not with a change of key but only on the basis of a gestural differentiation of these two events.

The progressive tonality of the movement (from D minor to F sharp major) has its crux in a correspondence with the greatest gestural change of the movement—the climactic section (bars 267–298). Before this, the tonal train of keys was derailing, given that the section in D minor (bars 245–266) includes three events (*Event e*, *Event c(a)* and *Event f*) and considering an apparently definitive predominance of *Event c(a)* over *Event b* at bars 261–266. However, the ‘gestural shock’ of the quotations from the first movement—*Event x(V)* at bars 267–274, *Event c2(V)* (climax) at bars 275–283 and *Event x(V)* at bars 284–298 (Mahler’s ‘grosse Appell’ to his ideas)—reveals the predominance of *Event c(a)* (bars 251–260) as illusory. This section sounds like a ‘false’ and early conclusion, in D minor, the same key of the beginning of the movement. This gestural change induces Mahler to regain the lost lyrical dimension expressed by the first movement’s first theme (which I called ‘*Event a*’) in the extended *Event b* (bars 299–400), in the common key of F sharp major. But it is just this *Event b* that the listener awaited in vain, because of the illusory predominance of *Event c(a)* at bars 251–260, and because of the presence of fragments of the *Erntelied* motive in *Event d* (bars 175–190), motive *k* in the occurrence of *Event e* at bars 245–250, and motive *k* in the occurrence of *Event f* at bars 261–266.

The durational plot of the events supports the above gestural plot of opposition between themes *Event B* and *Event c(a)*. After the long-lasting duration of *Event a* and *Event b* in the

---

<sup>116</sup> Agawu (1986, p. 225), in his analysis of the first movement of the Tenth, specifies that by using Ratner’s (1980, pp. 48–51) terminology, “solar” refers to the [more improvisatory] circular arrangement of keys found chiefly in eighteenth-century concertos and fantasias while “polar” denotes the [more conventionalized and codified] contrasting arrangement in which the dominant key is set in opposition to its major tonic, as in many sonata-allegro movements’.

exposition, there is a reduction of the duration of *Event b* in the development that is challenged by *Event c(a)*. *Event b*'s duration is, however, gradually restored in each of its occurrences (bars 30–71, 98–103, 145–151, 163–174, 191–224, 225–244). The long-lasting duration of *Event b* in the recapitulation (bars 299–400) seems the marker of its prevailing over *Event c(a)*. The frequency of events also participates in the above plot. The decline in the frequency of events after the climactic section also indicates the prevailing of *Event b* over *Event c(a)*. Moreover, the omitted presentation of *Event c(a)* in strophes IX and X (Table 7.1, II, 178) assumes particular importance as a marker of a final prevailing of *Event b*. In this recapitulation, the absence of catalysers is also significant because it seems an indication of the liquidation of the temporal stratification of the narrative in the non-narrative conclusion of the movement.

The speed of events also contributes to rendering the musical 'discourse' more unpredictable. In fact, although there are few verbal tempo indications (at bars 84, 119 and 125) during the movement, there are many implicit tempo changes because of the succession of highly rhythmically differentiated numerous events—see, for example, *Event a*, *Event b* and *Event c(a)*.

The discursive order of the events can be read in light of the above plot. As in the first movement of the Ninth Symphony (Micznik, 2001, pp. 237–238), in the development (strophe VIII) there is an inversion of the order of the sequence of nuclei established at the beginning of the movement. Here, then, via the catalyser *Event e*, *Event c(a)* follows *Event b* at just the moment at which the listener, after the increasing duration of the previous *Event b* occurrences, awaits the final prevailing of *Event b*. This device is made more effective by the catalysers *Event e* and *Event f*, which increase the expectation of *Event b*. In the recapitulation, this long wait is finally satisfied, not just by the long-lasting duration of *Event b* but also by the omitted presentations of *Event c(a)* and the restoration of the key of the



entire Symphony, F sharp major.

### 3. The Process of Narrativisation in Bars 238–400

In this section, I shall identify the diachronic process of narrativisation during the compositional process of the two areas whose preliminary pages (V-SS10, V-SS8, V-SS14) survive, according to the movement's compositional chronology (Table 2.15, II, 17–18). The first area includes the portion between the end of V-SS7 (numbered by Mahler with '5'), bar 238, and V-SS9 (numbered by Mahler with '6'), whose last bar is 248. In this area we find three versions, shown in Tables 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, respectively (II, 185–187). The second area, bars 298–400 on page V-SS11 (numbered by Mahler with '7'), to V-SS17 (numbered by Mahler with '10') contains two genetic versions, shown in Tables 7.5 and 7.6, respectively (II, 185–188). In the next two sections I will present the evidence that suggests a process of narrativisation of each of these two areas.

#### 3.1 The Process of Narrativisation in the First Area

At the level of 'story', concerning morphology and syntax, in the first genetic version the few changes between the bars of V-SS8 and their very similar rewriting on V-SS9 seem to have no narratological significance. In the second genetic version, on V-SS10, the bars (indicated with 238 e–tt in Ex. 7.16, II, 184) are discarded., and so in a later compositional stage have no rewriting or refining which are comparable to them. Bars 245–248 on V-SS9 (Ex. 7.15, II, 182, in the square, refined at the beginning of V-SS10; Fig. 7.2, II, 183, oval 1; Ex. 7.16, II, 184, square 1)<sup>117</sup> and bars 239–242 on V-SS8, refined at the beginning of V-SS9 (Ex. 7.15, II, 179, squares 1 and 2), do not exhibit significant morphological difference.

---

<sup>117</sup> Bouwman (1, 2017, 1, p. 151; Ex. 7.16, II, 183) numbers these bars '238 a–d', considering them discarded.

However, some useful indications concerning semantics can be inferred from the chronology of the area. Many bars on both versions of V-SS8 and V-SS10 refer to *Event b*'s semantic world, notably the *Erntelied motive* and motives of *Groups j and k*, all of which are connected structurally with *Event b*. In particular, bars 238 e–ff on V-SS10 (Ex. 7.16, II, 184) present the prevalent *Group k* motives. On V-SS8, the first four bars (numbered 238 uu–xx), and bars 239–241 clearly refer to motive *Group j* (Ex. 7.15, II, 179, in the circles). On the same page, bars 242 a–t have motives from *Group k*, and the discarded and cancelled bars 242 a–gg and 242 ee–ff–gg include melodic materials primarily from the *Erntelied motive* and motive *Group k* (Ex. 7.15, II, 178–179). The case of bars 238 gg–tt of V-SS10 is likewise semantically significant (Ex. 7.16, II, 184). These bars, with their prevalence of motives from *Groups d, b* and *II*, refer to the topic 'a la Purgatorio' of *Event c(a)*, and also to the climactic section (bars 267–298). The chords of the section suggest ascribing these bars to the semantics of this latter area. They are slightly different motivically from that area of the movement, but the gesture of the sound mass given by tied chords is the same.

More interesting evidence of narrativity during the compositional process can be detected at the 'discourse' level. The passage from the first two versions characterises and refines the movement's plot, as seen in the last version at the last compositional stage. The first and second versions lack the narrative strength of the third, as is evident by comparing the overall respective gestural pathways of all three versions. The first version (Table 7.2, II, 185) accomplishes an extension of *Event b*'s duration, which makes it seem in advance that *Event b* is the winner of the 'challenge' with *Event c(a)*.

*Event b*'s dominance is slightly reduced in the second version (Table 7.3, II, 186). Here, after the early presentation of *Event e* (bars 245–248) at the beginning of V-SS10, the return of *Event b* is immediate (bars 238 e–ff of V-SS10), and only then does it present *Event c(a)* (V-SS10, bars 238 gg–tt). Afterwards, on V-SS8 there is a return of *Event b* having

prevailing motives *Group j* of bars 238 uu–xx and bars 239, 241 and 243, rewritten on V-SS9. Only then on this page do we see the catalyser *Event e*, bars 245–248.

In the third version (Table 7.4, II, 187), after the occurrence of *Event b* in bars 225–244, the catalyser *Event e* in bars 245–250 follows, with the *Erntelied motive* in bars 243–244. *Event e* on its own determines the waiting for *Event b*, which is eluded by the nucleus *Event c(a)* (bars 251–260), itself followed by another catalyser (*Event f*, bars 261–266) and again by a climax. After this, the return of *Event b* can be ‘liberating’, arriving only with the long-lasting return of *Event b* in bars 299–380. Coburn (2002, p. 57) believes that Mahler may have rethought this entire section, and V-SS10 may have been his initial attempt at an entirely new version. But the increasing narrativity during the compositional process across the three versions (Exs. 7.2–7.4, II, 185–187) makes us think that V-SS10 presents early, discarded, ideas rather than the starting point for a new version, as Coburn thinks since the first two versions are narratively less effective than the third. So about the dimension of gestural connotations, the last compositional stage reveals a discrepancy between the sense of illusory closure given by the return of the opening key of D minor, which is protracted for three events (bars 245–266), and the huge gestural variety apparent in the passage. The preparatory material proposes another less effective discrepancy. Thus, in the first and second versions, it is not the gestural plot that is ‘digressive’ but the tonal pathway within one ‘event’, *Event b* (Tables 7.2 and 7.3, II, 185–186, in red). In these versions, then, a formal predictability—of the early return of *Event b* in the second version, in a pattern which is closer to traditional formal conception—corresponds with a tonal variability. In terms of temporal parameters, it is evident that in the revision from the first version into the second one there is a process of reducing the duration of *Event b*. In the third version (Table 7.4, II, 187, in red), the occurrence of this event is further reduced and becomes a brief allusion (bars 238–244) that makes the listener need its fulfilment at bars 299–400.

There is a significant change to the order of events during the compositional process to improve the narrative effectiveness of the ‘discourse’. On V-SS10, at bars 245–248, the catalyser *Event e* (Table 7.3, II, 186) is anticipated at the same place of bars 239–242, which in the last compositional stage (on V-SS9) corresponds to the end of *Event b*’s occurrence in bars 225–244 (Table 7.4, II, 187). With this change, Mahler highlights the unexpected occurrence of *Event c(a)*, which inverts the topical pattern followed to that point and delays the arrival for *Event b*, whose expectation is generated by the sevenths of *Event e*.

### 3.2 The Process of Narrativisation in the Second Area

The second genetic version (at the last compositional stage) of this area seems to tell a little bit less about a possible narrative strategy, given that it consists mainly of a transposition from B flat major to F sharp major. Having finished writing a first version (Table 7.5, II, 187) of the conclusion of the movement in B flat major (bars 298–400), Mahler then returned to page V-SS11 (Ex. 7.9, II, 168–169), cancelled bars 315–322 and added an insertion sign and the word ‘*Einlage*’ at the end of bar 298 on that page (Ex. 7.9, II, 168–169). From this point, it departs from the version of the last compositional stage (Table 7.6, II, 188). It consists of the addition of an ‘*Einlage*’ (bars 299–314)—lacking on V-SS11—on V-SS14 (see the transcription in Bowman 1, 2017, pp. 160–161), and then its definite refining on V-SS15 (see the transcription in Bowman 1, 2017, pp. 160–161). But in this version Mahler transposes bars 315–400 on V-SS15, V-SS16 and V-SS17, previously written in B flat major on V-SS14, V-SS11, V-SS12 and V-SS13, into the new key of F sharp major, with few and insignificant morphologic changes.

Given this chronology, there are no added events or motives coming from different groups during the compositional process, so no ‘narrativisation’ of early sketches is evident. The ‘*Einlage*’ is then inserted inside a very long *Event b* occurrence in bars 299–400 (the

longest of the movement even without this insert), in the area of the lowest degree of narrativity of the movement, given the little morphological discontinuity. The causal link between the ‘gestural shock’ of the climax and the transposition I have already inferred earlier in this chapter, p. 234, seems confirmed and detailed genetically. On page V-SS11 Mahler conceived bars 275–283 (the climax) and also bars 315–324 of the reprise in the earlier key of B flat major. In fact, he probably decided to cancel bars 315–322 and add the word ‘*Einlage*’ on V-SS11 after he realised the insufficient response to the destabilising strength of the climax of the tonal area (B flat major) of bars 315–400 that he had meanwhile written in that page and on V-SS14, V-SS11, V-SS12 and V-SS13. It is surprising, however, that in retrospect that ‘gestural shock’ seems the only way to overcome the impasse of the false conclusion of the Symphony by the circular return of the starting key of D minor, rather distant in the circle of fifths from F sharp major, at the end of development (strophe VIII, Table 7.1, II, 178).

Another observation needs to be made to explain the key change during the compositional process of bars 315–400. In a circular way, the transposition connects this final part of the finale neither with the beginning of the movement in D minor (as it happens for the ‘illusory’ finishing of the strophe IX), nor with that of the first movement. (The chromatic and tonally ambiguous introduction–refrain *Event x(V)*, which recurs at the end of the climax (bars 284–298) is a meta-referential ‘outside’.) Thus, Mahler probably intended to connect the reprise (the conclusion of the finale) not to the ‘once upon a time’ of the Symphony (that is, the refrain *Event x(V)*), but to the ‘actual’ beginning of that time—the lyrical first movement of the Symphony in the same key. During the compositional process, the change of key further improves this sense of Proustian *temp retrouve*, which would have been incomplete without the transposition. Precisely because of this non-narrative absence of significant morphological and gestural changes, this is the marker of the completion of the Symphony,

both at the level of the discursive stream of the version of the last compositional draft and that of the compositional process. Perhaps that romantically redemptive return to the home key of F sharp major makes the whole narrative of the Symphony ‘incidental’, a teleological necessity to overcome the continuous pitfalls of the *Weltlauf*. Only in the framework of that key can Mahler give a sense of that gesture of opening identified by Johnson (2009, p. 87) — the empty fifths evoking the chiming bells. So, by this gesture Mahler’s subjective lyricism is finally liberated from the repression of the *Weltlauf*.

#### 4. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the Fifth Movement

At first sight, a narrative interpretation of the fifth movement is more difficult because of its series of apparently contrasting overall aspects, coming from my analysis of sections 1–3. In one sense, it has the highest degree of narrativity of the Symphony, given the large number of events, of small motives which become autonomous during the movement, and of refrains which work as if they were epic ‘fixed formulas’, intended as aids for the memory of a storyteller. However, the movement also has the longest occurrence of a single ‘event’ in a section—the coda—that is free of other events and so seems not to be narrative-like, given this section’s lack of those gestural and semantical contrasts which are markers of a high degree of narrativity. In spite of its incompleteness, then, the movement seems to have a very ‘finished’, consistent teleological plot. At the same time, as claimed by Johnson (2009, p. 92), the ‘chiming of bells’ of empty fifths makes us think of an opening, not a closing. In this way, I would add, we are led to think that the ‘story’ is not finished and is restarting in the closing bars of the movement.

To reunite these contradictions into a unified idea of the possible overall narrative intention of the ‘implied author’, manifested during the compositional process, we have the support of only a small number of preliminary manuscript pages. But these seem to provide

clear indications of a narrative direction in the compositional process; and we can also count on precise references to it in the letters and poems written to Alma during the conception of the movement. The starting consideration of this enterprise is that this movement, intended as an Adornian *Erfüllung* ('fulfilment'), follows the cyclic symphonic model, traced back to Beethoven's Ninth, of the last movement as a final teleological recapitulation of the entire piece. Significant for our purpose here is the presence, as in Beethoven's movement (though with a completely different expressive intention), of musical ideas taken from the previous movements.

As I will suggest in what follows, the *Erfüllung* in this movement appears as the final consequence of the numerous narrative premises disseminated in the Symphony. To be more precise, this movement leads to the fulfilment (and conclusion) of the 'novel' depicted by the meta-referential 'scriptorial' narrative features of the previous movements. We can infer this aspect by observing *Event b* during the movement. The ever-longer occurrences of this theme seem to be intended as a completion of the 'sketches'—the *Erntelied motive*—disseminated in an isolated form here and in the third movement. This is suggested by the fact that this motive assumes a bridging function to link other ideas in a homogenous and fluent melodic flow. *Event b*'s long-lasting continuity, especially notable in the occurrences at the end of the movement (bars 299–380, 381–400), seems an answer to all of the numerous blocks of melodic continuity, impeded by the *Weltlauf* during the entire Symphony. This aspect might imply that the listener, like the reader of a novel, can finally follow the continuation of the 'story' of that melodic unfolding blocked or delayed during the Symphony. This is evident in the progressive continuity of this theme and the teleological prominence given it by the gestural plot—and, especially, by the position of the climax (bars 275–283) just before the first long-lasting occurrence of *Event b* (bars 299–400) in the recapitulation. Thus, *Event b* seems not only an homage to Alma but also the

teleological continuity of the draft versus the non-teleology of sketches, stylised in the isolated presentation of the *Erntelied motive* in the third movement and in this movement. The homage is definitely ‘scriptorial’, as a meta-referential retelling in music of the act of (re)writing that Lied.

Compared to the meta-referential passages of other movements, however, there are some slight but significant differences here. In fact, already at bars 30–71 in the *Einleitung*, *Event b* is presented in one of its longest occurrences of the movement. In the first and second movements, though, the continuity of *Event a* and *Event b(x)* and of *Group III motive* was gradually achieved during the movement. More specifically, after this long first occurrence of that *Event b* (41 bars), the following occurrences are shorter, though they lengthen until the ‘liberating’ occurrences of the recapitulation (bars 299–400). In other words, a pathway of progressive extension of the duration of *Event b* occurrences starts not at its first occurrence in the *Einleitung*, but only at bar 83 with the ‘Allegro moderato’, which begins the ‘struggle’ between the two themes. The immediate continuity of *Event b* occurrences in the *Einleitung* can be explained by regarding this *Event a* as a ‘prologue’ that presents two ‘characters’: the fragmentary *Event a* (due to the short motives belonging to *Groups II* and *d*), and *Event b*, which is presented with its characterising feature shown by all its occurrences i.e. continuity.

Another detail to mention concerning this area of the movement is that there are no meta-referential markers as with the first movement’s motive *Event x* or the ‘stuttering memory’ cell (Ex. 3.10, II, 30). As a result, nothing indicates the different verb tenses of *Event a* and *Event b* within the same diegetic level, but there is a ‘spatial’ indicator, as suggested by the fireman anecdote, that if it is not the inspirational origin and so the ‘programme’ of the *Einleitung* it can at least be understood as a metaphorical explanation of the passage. As per section 1 of this chapter, then, the death march can be taken as ‘outside’ (out the window of



the hotel of New York) *Event b* (the homage to Alma, who was close to Mahler on this side of the window in that hotel room). But, as ever in Mahler, possible ‘programmes’ can be taken as effects rather than as causes of the inwardness of the music. I can explain my reading of *Event b* as an *inside*, in light of the meta-referential reading above. From this viewpoint, the resolution of the conflict between *Event a* and *Event b* in the *Einleitung* happens on a meta-referential scriptorial plane of *Erfüllung*, of a morphological and ‘redemptive’<sup>118</sup> completion of the sketches of Alma’s *Erntelied* from the ‘Purgatorio’ third movement. This means that *on this side* of the window is the ‘scriptorial’ (and compositional) homage to Alma in the mental ‘composing hut’ of the writing process—a dimension suggested by Mahler’s activity of assembling the ‘cohesive’ *Erntelied motive* to make the continuous *Event b*. *Outside the window*, it cannot be that the intertextually different and dramatic world of the funeral of the musical self or fireman—*Event a*—is related to the *Weltlauf* of the following *Event c(a)*, which comes from *Event a*. The linking of these two opposed worlds is given by the *Erntelied motive* occurrences (isolated by rests) of bars 12–14 and 22–24. They seem to represent not only the last breaths of the dying musical self or fireman, but also the border between the sketch-like fragmentary world of *Event a* and the world, announced by these motives and by the sevenths, of the continuous, draft-like *Event b*. Moreover, in this outside–inside passage these motives seem to be interjections that close the ‘theatrical piece’ of the fourth movement (see Chapter Six, section 6), whose ‘story’ finishes with the initial bars of the fifth movement to lead the listener to the ‘composing hut’.

The end of the developmental section raises another important meta-referential point, whose narrative intentionality can be corroborated by existing preliminary pages. After bar

---

<sup>118</sup> David Matthews (2007, p. 515), thinks that bars 112–115 (the occurrence of *Erntelied Event*) of the ‘Purgatorio’ contain the ‘seed of redemption’ which will be represented in the fifth movement in the passage from *Event a* (bars 1–29) to *Event b* (bars 30–71).

238, I showed in section 3.1, pages V-SS10, V-SS8 and the cancelled bars of V-SS9 make *Event b* prevail in that area of the movement. The discarding of those bars at the last compositional stage (at bars 261–266), though, determines the provisional and illusory dominance of *Event c(a)* in that same area. Again, I pointed out that the ‘gestural shock’ of the following climax (bars 275–283) and the following motive *Event x(V)* (bars 284–298), taken from the first movement, seems to be intended by Mahler to resolve that impasse. According to Rothkamm (2003, p. 55), Mahler transposed the climax and the remaining part of the movement from B flat major to F sharp major and conceived these passages after the psychoanalytical session with Freud on 26 August 1910. From these aspects, then, I infer here that this impasse and its resolution can be intended as a meta-narrative plot device. This seems to be supported by the placing of *Event x(V)* after that impasse, the climax, and before the longest-lasting occurrence of *Event b* (bars 299–400). In fact, *Event x(V)* in that position seems to maintain the introductory, meta-referential function that was also demonstrated by *Event x* in the first movement. That is, like in the latter, *Event x(V)* is, metaphorically, the ‘quill’ in Mahler’s hand, mentioned in the poem to Alma written on 17 August 1910, during the conception of this movement. Here this *Event x(V)* idea has an even stronger function of a collection of ideas, of a ‘grosse Appel’ to his own ideas, just to overcome that impasse. To further support the analogy with the first movement, it is significant that *Event x(V)* again introduces a lyrical theme, as *Event x* does in the first movement, similar to *Event a* at the beginning of that movement.

The overcoming of that impasse is further explained by that same poem to Alma: ‘Die Zeit ist da, die Feder ist zur Hand / Doch die Gedanken wollen nicht verweilen’ (‘The time has come, the quill is in my hand—Yet this idea continually eludes me’). These verses cannot, as per de La Grange-Weiss (GMAB, 2004, p. 376), refer only to the moment of beginning to write the work, but more specifically to the bars (238–266) of this impasse

which, according to Rothkamm's chronology, Mahler was conceiving when writing that poem. It is likely that the stylised compositional impasse is also an expression of Mahler's actual difficulty in finishing the movement. This is further supported by the credible assumption that in those hard days of marital and personal crises, Mahler might have had difficulty concentrating and collecting his ideas.

In conclusion, arriving at the identification of Mahler's overall narrative intention during the compositional process is more difficult here than for other movements, given its few preparatory pages. By considering the pieces of evidence from the previous levels of analysis, however, it seems clear that the Genettian 'whole of the real or fictional situation in which that action takes place' (Genette, 1972/1980, p. 28) needs to be identified in a dialectic that is more essential to the movement than those contradictions I mentioned earlier. I refer to the dialectic between the dimensions of 'outside' and 'inside', which work with the above-mentioned meta-referential aspects as markers of a 'narrating' voice, the Genettian narrator created by the Ecovian 'implied author'. This means that, given the evidence above-mentioned, one cannot think that the entire 'narrative' of the movement comes from a single storyteller who is recounting his act of writing the story. This storyteller, who is *on this side* of the window of the 'compositing hut', is also *external* to the story he's telling. He is, in Genette's terms, 'extradiegetic' and 'heterodiegetic', because he tells events that are outside (*Event a* and *Event c(a)*) and inside (*Event b*) the ideal threshold of the writing process. Once again, the meta-referential connotative and intertextual play fills in for the lack of referential–denotative resource of verb tenses in indicating the 'who' of the narrative act. The narrating voice seems to be alternating inside or outside of the window of the metaphorical 'compositing hut' from which the Genettian 'intradiegetic narrator' is writing.

# Chapter Eight. ‘The Writing Hand’<sup>119</sup>

Having analysed each movement in the previous chapters, in section 1 of this chapter I will complete the third stage of my analysis by proposing my interpretation of the entire work, based on my intuitions about Mahler’s overall narrative intention. My reading finds support in the fact that each movement uses ‘scriptorial’ passages and similar gestural plots of a struggle between the fragmentariness of the *Weltlauf* and a melodic continuity. In this way, I propose that Mahler wanted to represent through the entire Symphony a searching for a pathway of continuity in the act of writing a melody, which is fully unfolded in the last movement. In section 2 I will present a summary of my dissertation, indicating its contribution to scholarship and possible directions for new research.

## 1. Overall Narrative Interpretation of the Entire Symphony

From the pieces of evidence of my analysis, another inference remains to be made: the identification of a possible overall narrative plot for the Symphony. This kind of narrative organisation of the piece, which Monahan (2015, p. 82) defines as a ‘transsymphonic narrative’, is a problematic and controversial area of study, given the contradictory indications from Mahler’s music. In Mahler’s symphonies, each movement sometimes seems to constitute a distinct narrative world, in terms of its morphological features and expressive character, that is separate from the diegetic pathway of other movements. This happens, for example, with the Adagietto of the Fifth Symphony and, as I showed in Chapter Five, in the third movement of the Tenth. As a consequence, concerning the Third

---

<sup>119</sup> As per footnote 95, p. 179 by this phrase I allude both to Mahler’s hand, mentioned in GMAB, 2004, nos. 329 and 330, and to the nickname many critics gave to Proust.

Symphony, Monahan observes that

[...] shortly before the 1896 premiere, Mahler arranged for several of [this Symphony's] movements to be performed independently (Franklin 1991, pp. 24–25), suggesting that they had, in his mind, enough conceptual autonomy not to strike audiences as open-ended or unintelligible excisions from an otherwise unspecified whole (Monahan 2015, p. 83).

From another point of view, however, Mahler often follows what Darcy (2001, p. 44) defines as a ‘victory-through-struggle paradigm’, and that ‘at its most basic level, this narrative trajectory entails the “redemption”—the drive toward a metaphysical *Erlösung*, to use a term with appropriately Wagnerian resonances’ (Darcy, 2001, p. 44). This teleological pathway ‘may encompass a single movement, as in the finale of Mahler’s First Symphony, or it may span an entire multi-movement work, as it does in his Second and Fifth’ (Darcy, 2001, p. 44). The direction indicated by Darcy finds credible confirmation in writings by Newcomb (1992) and Samuels (1995, pp. 149–165). But in the Ninth and Sixth, these scholars detect general plot-archetypal paradigms, not a specific overall ‘story’ told by those symphonies.

The need for greater scholarly depth leads me to be more specific than these models, to credibly identify such an overall ‘story’ of the Symphony. And so once again, my perspective is different from that of existing approaches to Mahler’s music. I aim to identify Mahler’s intention as detectable in the diachronic plan of the compositional process, rather than in its outcome in the final version (or that of the last compositional stage) of the Symphony. The research question, then, is not *synchronically* ‘What is the overall narrative?’ but *diachronically* ‘What story is Mahler attempting to tell during the compositional process of the work?’ I seek an Ecovian textual intention that can work as an authorial ‘control horizon’ for future interpretations of the Symphony.

From this perspective, a starting and more generic stage of observation is that, during the compositional process of the Tenth, we observe Mahler's evident intention to depict in music, across the entire Symphony, a pathway of progressive achievement of a melodic continuity. This pathway, in the fifth movement's long-lasting melody of bars 299–400, is victorious after its struggles with the *Weltlauf* in the previous movements and in that same movement. In other words, in spite of a biographical watershed between the first two movements, composed before the episode of the Gropius letter, and the final three, composed after that episode, my analysis reveals unifying aspects of the Symphony. They are the use of common motives between the movements, certainly, but above all, the fact that each of them uses meta-referential 'scriptorial' passages and similar gestural plots of a struggle between the fragmentariness of the *Weltlauf* and a melodic continuity. These aspects prompt me to propose a unified novelistic 'story' that Mahler intended to tell in the five movements of his Symphony.<sup>120</sup>

In the first movement, Mahler's effort to achieve this melodic continuity is evident in the later additions during the compositional process. This happens:

- in the exposition, with the 'stuttering memory' cells introduced on I-DSS5 (Ex. 3.16, II, 43, bars 17, 18, 19) and Bergquist's 'displacements' in the OD, which are traces in the OD of an 'effort of memory' during the compositional process (the complicated compositional process of *Event a*, the indication '*1/2 ton tiefer*' on I-DSS7 and the very frequent changes of octaves);
- in the development, with the 'stuttering memory' cell (Coburn's cell 4)

---

<sup>120</sup> Eveline Nikkels (1991) and Coburn (2003, pp. 300–333) define this possible 'story' of the Symphony in terms of 'roman à clef', by the numerous verbal inscriptions of the manuscript and their relation to the musical text. My reading is evidently different, based instead mainly on the textual musical analysis of the manuscript materials of the Symphony.

- introduced in bars 147–149 on page I-DSS14 (Ex. 3.18, II, 47, square 2);
- in the coda, with the longer-lasting *Event b(x)* melody at bars 217–227 (Ex. 3.14, II, 35), conceived in sketches I-PSK3 and I-PSK4 (Ex. 3.26, II, 61), and with the ‘theft’ of the key of D major by *B(x)* at bars 221–224, I-SS10 (via pages I-PSK3 and I-PSK4), to the *Event x* occurrence (bars 244–252) on I-DSS17, I-DSS21 and I-SS9, all conceived prior to page I-SS10.

In the second movement, this aspiration to melodic continuity is evident at the draft level of the last compositional stage in the thematic emancipation of *Group III motive* in *Event d(c)1–Event d(c)2*, and at a compositional process level in the additive conception in the later pages of the occurrence of *Group III motive* and in the entire section *Event d(c)1*, conceived of as an ‘Einlage’ on page II-DSS23. In both movements, however, the melodic continuity cannot prevail over the *Weltlauf*. In fact, after the long-lasting melody of *Event b(x)* at bars 217–227 in the coda of the first movement, there is a thematic fragmentation. In the second movement, the melodically fluent *Event d(c)1–2* is interrupted by the sudden restart of the *Weltlauf* (bars 444–468, 469–491) that ultimately prevails triumphantly (bars 499–522). Also, the third and the fourth movements present flashes of melodic continuity, with the *Erntelied* quotations in the third and with the ‘cantabile-construction of telling’ sections (bars 57–98, 458–477) in the fourth. Again, however, neither of these movements presents an *Erfüllung* (‘fulfillment’) of melodic continuity.

It is especially important to detect the compositional pathway that led Mahler to write the finale of the Symphony. Once the fourth movement was composed, Mahler tried to exchange it with the second as the Finale of the Symphony. Mahler probably then began to search for a more narratively compelling solution to the conflict between melodic continuity and the *Weltlauf*, in favour of the former. Although neither of these two movements presents

a fulfilment of melodic continuity, the fourth, given its ‘closed ending’ (see Chapter Six, section 6), might at least be better able to finish the Symphony. Thus, Mahler left this movement in the position we now know by putting in the title manuscript page the Roman numeral ‘IV’ and the word ‘Finale’. Neither of these two movements, however, could have worked as an effective finale—not only because of their lack of melodic continuity but also because both have a dramatic nature, given the absence of catalysers in the second movement and the gestural, ‘theatrical’ vividness of the fourth. This need for a narrative finale is also testified by the fact that, as I showed in Chapter Six, section 6, Mahler was making the fourth movement more ‘narrative’ throughout the compositional process, probably when he still considered it as a Finale. Later, Mahler found the definite narrative solution in the fifth movement, which presents another, decisive, fight between the melodic continuity of *Event b* and the feverish *Weltlauf* of *Event c(a)*, with the former finally prevailing (at bars 299–400) over the latter. But in this ultimate dominance, the Symphony turns from narrative to lyrics, given the absence of catalysers in the calm, long-lasting final melody in bars 299–400 of the last movement. This evolution is a Wagnerian *Erlösung* (‘salvation’) of the ‘story’, and in this sense it should be read in light of Floros’s (1998, p. 256) reference to the death of Isolde.

These pieces of genetic evidence lead me to identify the overall teleological plot of the Symphony with greater precision. As I explained earlier, I can detect Mahler’s evident intention, during the compositional process of the Tenth, to depict in music a pathway of progressive achievement of a melodic continuity. I can add here that it seems to me that in the Tenth, Mahler wanted to represent a progressive (and laborious) search for continuity of an act of writing a melody, an act which is finally unfolded fully in the last movement (bars 299–499).

This is supported by the numerous meta-referential ‘scriptorial’ passages in all



movements. Thus, in the first movement there is the search for continuity of Event *b(x)*. In the last compositional draft of the second movement there are the ‘additive sketches’ of *Group III motive* occurrences—then unfolded in Events *d(c)1–2* in analogy with their additive genesis. In the third movement these scriptorial passages include what I described as ‘the irruption of the everyday life’ (Mahler’s revision of Alma’s Lied) into the childlike world, and the word ‘Gehalten’ at bars 107–108, which was absent in the DSS and added only in the SS, along with the ‘stuttering memory’ cell (bars 106–107, Ex. 5.7, II, 111, square 4 and circles 1 and 2). In the fourth movement, there is the later addition of bars 57–98 and bars 458–477, on page IV-FD5 and in the last compositional draft, respectively, which I defined as ‘construction from fragments’. Finally, in the fifth movement these scriptorial elements are Alma’s *Event b* as ‘completion’, and the definite *Erfüllung* of the third movement’s *Erntelied*’s motives and of the fragments of it (belonging to motive *Group IV*) in bars 11–14 and 22–24. I can therefore say that this is an overall pathway of *Erlösung* (‘salvation’), of redemption through writing.

From this perspective, a first level of interpretation of the overall narrative plot of the entire Symphony is an ‘autobiography in notes’, a depiction of a Berliozian ‘*épisode de la vie d’un artiste*’. In this time-worn perspective—legitimated by the great amount of autobiographical references in Mahler’s music—the autobiographical pathway of the Symphony is that of a Genettian intradiegetic narrator. This narrator, like his ‘empirical author’ (the historical Mahler) finds his salvation in a religious pathway—from expiation (third movement) and death (fourth movement) to resurrection (fifth movement)—and in Mahler’s reconciliation with his wife. The study of the compositional process and its contextual letters, however, reveals a more complex relationship with the narrator’s reality. The meta-referential pathway of the Tenth Symphony is a significant example of Barthes’s changed function of ‘modern scriptor’ and the performative dimension of his writing.

Mahler makes a ‘notation, representation, “depiction”’, I can say in Barthes’s terms, of an episode of his own life, representing the way of telling it—or, to be more precise, the way of writing it in his mental ‘composing hut’. Also evident in this is a clear emancipation of the writing as a character, as if Mahler’s writing ‘hand, [was] cut off from any voice’ (Barthes, 1967/1977, p. 1), an autonomous, invisible agent, separate from Mahler’s body during the compositional process. It seems to be the ‘hand that ever held me’ of the poem to Alma, dated 17 August (GMAB, 2004, p. 378, no. 330). Its incessant activity symbolises life itself, a ‘life force which Springs-up from composer wounds’ (a paraphrase of Mahler’s poem to Alma in GMAB, 2004, p. 378, no. 330).

The empirical composer, then, found the salvation of his soul through a reconciliation with his wife and his psychical ghosts—thanks also to Freud. The narrator of the Tenth Symphony saves his soul through his writing—or, more specifically, through his writing hand.

## 2. Summary of the Research and Its Contribution to Scholarship

The starting point of my dissertation was the vigorous debate on narrativity in Mahler’s music, from Adorno’s *Mahler: Eine Musikalische Physiognomik* (1960) to more recent contributions (for example, Monahan, 2017). I made an initial hypothesis in Chapter One that there is a ‘narrative impulse’, *narrativisation*, that runs through the compositional process, from the initial sketches to the draft of the last compositional stage, leaving potential traces of narrativity in all manuscript materials. My second hypothesis was that behind this impulse is a composer’s communicative intention (Eco’s ‘*intentio auctoris*’) that can be more fully understood only by considering the traces of *narrativisation* left through the sketches and drafts.

In Chapters Three to Seven, I have used my three-staged analytic apparatus to support these hypotheses in each movement of the Tenth. In this way, my research pathway adds to current Mahlerian scholarship; not only is the draft of the last compositional stage novelistic, as Adorno, Micznik and others have asserted, but Mahler also ‘makes music in the way others narrate’, to use Adorno’s famous aphorism (1960/1992, p. 63). That is, the numerous, precise and concordant pieces of evidence identified in my analysis in chapters Three to Seven can make us think that Mahler *intentionally* composed this Symphony by narrative organisation and strategy during the compositional process. So, draft after draft, Mahler ‘narrativised’ early traditional and ‘reified’ formal schemes which, like epic ‘fixed formulas’ in Adorno’s ‘nominalistic’ sense, work as aids and reference points for his compositional effort.

But the most significant contribution to scholarship is my reading of the Symphony in terms of a meta-referential ‘scriptorial’ unfinishedness, intended not as a mere ‘technical’ condition of an interrupted compositional process but as an aesthetic attribute. In other words, supported by numerous, precise and concordant pieces of evidence in my analysis, I can say that the compositional process of the entire work shows Mahler’s intentional meta-referential representation in the product of the last compositional draft and the process of memorial writing.

As I have highlighted in my discussion of the existing literature in the Introduction and in Chapter One, current Mahler scholarship does not consider his narrative strategy during his compositional process. The risk with this omission is in neglecting the modernist diachronic nature of this music, whose final or last version seems (even in completed works) only the tip of the iceberg of the ‘past of writing’, subject to further improvements—the *Retuschen* (‘retouches’)—in a long and virtually unfinished process. My ‘genetic’—narratological approach seems to me to fill this gap with my invoking of an interpretative

perspective in the general field of music narrativity of Mahler's music and, more specifically, in scholarship on the Tenth. In light of my approach, however, I can more precisely specify my contribution to scholarship in terms of positioning Mahler's music within a broader perspective of musical cultural history.

At the level of the work's final version, the current literature generally highlights only the analogies between Mahler's music and the prose composition of novelists such as Jean Paul, Dostoyevsky and Sterne, beloved by Mahler and living one or more generations before him.<sup>121</sup> My 'genetic' study of sketches and drafts instead finds a composer familiar with the modernistic turn of his times, represented in literature by writers younger than Mahler, including Proust, Kafka and Musil, whose works Mahler probably had never read. Hence the advantage of a 'genetic'–narratological approach, with a focus on the intrinsic unfinishedness of Mahler's music, is that it gives us a deeper view of the object of our study. In this way, we can more easily place Mahler's music within otherwise invisible networks of cultural history than can traditional methods of narratological analysis.

Future scholarly developments from my research may include extending the methods and outcomes of the present study to other works, and generalising to a broader research focus. This can happen within Mahler's music by applying and developing the method and outcomes of the present research to his other symphonies, such as the Third, Fourth and Ninth, for which a large amount of manuscript preparatory materials have survived. One task may be to discern in them the meta-referential play of the 'process within the product'. Finding these features in more of Mahler's works will bring about a new key to reading his music.

This extension and generalisation of my methods and outcomes can also happen for the

---

<sup>121</sup> Significant exceptions to this general trend are provided by Johnson (2014), Eve-Norah Pauset (2007) and Thomas Peattie (2002), who all shed light on similarities between Mahler and Proust.

works of other composers, whose music, like Mahler's, may have features of incompleteness and formal and morphological fragmentariness. This suspicion is supported by other writers. Richard Lambert (1997, p. 236), for example, ascribes a 'conflation of the creator with Creator' to three unfinished works: *Universe Symphony* by Charles Ives, *Mysterium* by Alexander Skryabin, and *Die Jakobsleiter* by Arnold Schönberg.<sup>122</sup> Thus, my suspicion is that in modernist music, as in other artistic expressions of the same period, we find an authorial paradigm of intrinsic meta-referential unfinishedness. An enquiry of this kind could certainly apply the interpretative paradigm of 'opera aperta' ('open work')—coined by Eco (1962) and generally ascribed to later twentieth-century composers—to music of this earlier period.

My dissertation began with textual analysis and then enlarged the context within view, shedding light on the role of Gustav Mahler within the cultural history of his time. With the outcome of the meta-referential 'scriptorial' unfinishedness, the resulting 'voice' is that of a composer who anticipates future trends of music and literature in the twentieth century. From this point of view, rather than concluding Mahler's life, his Tenth Symphony seems to open new pathways to understanding the relationship between art and writing.

---

<sup>122</sup> See also Richard Taruskin, 2008.

# Bibliography

## Primary sources

### Manuscripts

(See in the Appendix to Chapter Two, II, 2–18 see for detailed information about library signature marks and the location of each manuscript page of the symphony)

ÖNB Mus. Hs, 41634 MAG (Mahler's Notebook).

Alma-ms1-004 and Alma-ms1-005, Fonds La Grange of the Médiathèque Musicale Mahler Paris (Manuscript of Alma Mahler's 'Erntelied').

### Editions

Mahler, Gustav. *Adagio aus Der Symphonie Nr. 10 für Grosses Orchester*. Edited by Erwin Ratz, Universal Edition, 1969.

CF '76–CF '89.

Mahler, Gustav. *A Performing Version of the Draft for the Tenth Symphony*. Edited by Derryck Cooke, et al., Faber Music, 1976, 1989.

Mahler-Bouwman 1, 2, 3.

Mahler, Gustav. *Symphony No. 10 (Unfinished), Chronological Transcriptions of the Sketches, Short Scores and Orchestral Drafts*. (Volumes 1, 2, 3). Edited by Frans

Bouwman, Donemus, 2017.

## Facsimiles

ZF

Mahler, Gustav. *Zehnte Symphonie. (Faksimile–Ausgabe ... Nach Entwurf Rudolf Geyer).*

Paul Zsolnay Verlag, 1924.

RF

Mahler, Gustav. *X. Symphonie. Faksimile Nach der Handschrift. Herausgegeben von Erwin*

*Ratz. Skizzenblätter zur Zehnten Symphonie.* Edited by Erwin Ratz, Verlag Walter Ricke,

Laurin–Verlag, 1967.

## Published Letters and Testimonies

AME

Mahler, Alma, and Gustav Mahler. *Gustav Mahler: Erinnerungen und Briefe.* Allert de

Lange, 1940.

---. *Memories and Letters.* Murray, 1946.

GMAB

Gustav, Mahler. *Gustav Mahler: Letters to His Wife.* Edited by Henry-Louis de La Grange,

et al., revised and translated by Antony Beaumont, Cornell University Press, 2004.

Mahler, Gustav. *Briefe.* Translated by Herta Blaukopf. Zsolnay, 1982.

Mahler, Gustav. *Selected Letters of Gustav Mahler.* Edited by Knud Martner, Faber, 1979.

## Unpublished Correspondence

Letter from Gustav Mahler to Emil Hertzka.

BSB

BSB Ana 600 B, I, 2, b

Letters from Alma Mahler to Walter Gropius

BA

1 Bl. Hschr. Toblach, 'Montag.' Sent on 1[8].7.1910.

1 Bl. hschr. Toblach, 'Montag abend.' Sent on 1[9].7.1910.

1 Bl. hschr. Toblach, 'Sonntag nacht.' Sent on 25.7.1910.

1 Bl. Hschr Toblach, 'Donnerstag,' 2[8].7.1910.

2 Bl. bds. hschr. Toblach, 'Sonntag,' [31.7.1910].

2 Bl. bds. hschr. Toblach, 'Montag,' 8. [8.]1910.

1 Bl. bds. hschr. Toblach, 'Mittwoch,' 10.8.1910.

1 Bl. hschr. Toblach, 'Sonntag,' [14].8.1910.

1 Bl. hschr. Toblach, 'Mittwoch,' 17. [8]. 1910.

1 Bl. bds. hschr. mit Beiblatt. Toblach, 'Dienstag,' [23.8.1910].

3 Bl. bds. hschr. [Toblach] [26.8.1910]. [Received on '27.8.10. Abends'].

## Secondary Sources

Abbate, Carolyn. *Unsung Voices: Opera and Musical Narrative in the Nineteenth Century*.

Princeton University Press, 1991.

Adorno, Theodor W. *Mahler: Eine Musikalische Physiognomik*. Surhkamp, 1960.

---. *Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott, University of



Chicago Press, 1992.

Agawu, Victor Kofi. "Tonal Strategy in the First Movement of Mahler's Tenth Symphony."

*19th-Century Music*, vol. 9, no. 3, 1986, pp. 222–33.

Almén, Byron. *A Theory of Musical Narrative*. Indiana University Press, 2008.

Austin, John Langshaw. *How to Do Things with Words*. Edited by James Opie Urmson, Clarendon Press, 1962.

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhaïlovich. *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, and Voloshinov*, edited by Pam Morris, Arnold, 1994.

---. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Vol. 1. University of Texas Press, 2011.

Barham, Jeremy, editor. *The Cambridge Companion to Mahler*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

---, editor. *Perspectives on Gustav Mahler*. Ashgate, 2005.

Barthes, Roland. "Eléments De Sémiologie." *Communications*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1964, pp. 91–135.

---. *Elements of Semiology*. Translated by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith, Hill and Wang, 1968.

---. Roland. *Image, Music, Text: Essays Selected and Translated by Stephen Heath*. Fontana Press, 1977.

Barthes, Roland, and Lionel Duisit. "An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative." *New Literary History*, 1975, pp. 237–72.

Bergquist, Peter. "The First Movement of Mahler's Tenth Symphony: An Analysis and an Examination of the Sketches." *Music Forum*, vol. 5, 1980, pp. 335–394.

Bernaerts, Lars, and Van Hulle, Dirk. "Narrative Across Versions: Narratology Meets Genetic Criticism." *Poetics Today*, vol. 34, no. 3, 2013, pp. 281–326.

Bouwman, Frans. "Editing Mahler 10: Unfinished Business." *The Musical Times*, vol. 142,

- no. 1877, 2001, pp. 43–51.
- . “Mahler’s Tenth Symphony: Rediscovered Manuscript Pages, Chronology, Influences, and ‘Performing Versions.’” *Perspectives on Gustav Mahler*, edited by Jeremy Barham, Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005, pp. 457–547.
- Chatman, Seymour Benjamin. *Story and discourse: Narrative structure in fiction and film*. Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Carone, Angela. *La Narratologia Musicale: Applicazioni e Prospettive*. Trauben, 2006.
- Celestini Federico. “Heteroglossia and Hybridity in Gustav Mahler’s Wunderhorn Symphonies.” *EuTropes: The Paradox of European Empire*, edited by John W. Boyer and Berthold Molden, Chicago University Press, 2014, pp. 385–408.
- Coburn, Steven D. “Cyclic and Referential Elements in Mahler’s Tenth Symphony.” *Naturlaut*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2006, pp. 2–19.
- . *Mahler’s Tenth Symphony: Form and Genesis*. 2002. New York University, PhD dissertation. *UMI Dissertation Services*.
- Cone, Edward T. *The Composer’s Voice*. University of California Press, 1974.
- Cooke, Deryck. “The Facts Concerning Mahler’s Tenth Symphony.” *Chord and Discord* 2 (1963): 3–27
- Cooper, Barry. *Beethoven and the Creative Process*. Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Darcy, Warren. “Rotational Form, Teleological Genesis, and Fantasy-Projection in the Slow Movement of Mahler’s Sixth Symphony.” *19th-Century Music*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2001, pp. 49–74.
- de Biasi, Pierre-Marc. “Toward a Science of Literature: Manuscript Analysis and the Genesis of the Work.” *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-textes*, edited by Jed Deppman,

- Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004, pp. 36–94.
- Debray-Genette, Raymonde. “Flaubert’s ‘A Simple Heart’, or How to Make an Ending: A Study of the Manuscripts.” *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-texts*, edited by Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004, pp. 69–95.
- de La Grange, Henry-Louis. *Gustav Mahler*. Fayard, 1979.
- . *Gustav Mahler: La Vita, Le Opere*. Translated by Maurizio Disoteo, EDT, 2011.
- . *Gustav Mahler: A New Life Cut Short (1907–1911)*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Deppman, Jed, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, editors. *Genetic Criticism: Texts and Avant-Textes*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Dolfi, Anna, editor. *Non Finito: Opera Interrotta e Modernità*. Firenze University Press, 2015.
- Eco, Umberto. *I Limiti dell’Interpretazione*. Bompiani, 1990.
- . *The limits of interpretation*, Indiana University Press, 1994.
- . *Opera Aperta: Forma e Indeterminazione Nelle Poetiche Contemporanee*. Bompiani, 1962.
- . *The open work*. Translated by Anna Cancogni, Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Eggebrecht, Hans Heinrich. *La Musica di Gustav Mahler*. Translated by Laura Dallapiccola, La Nuova Italia, 1994.
- Feder, Georg. *Music Philology: An Introduction to Musical Textual Criticism, Hermeneutics, and Editorial Technique*. Translated by Bruce C. Macintyre, Hillsdale, 2011.
- Floros, Constantin. *Gustav Mahler: Visionary and Despot*. Arche Verlag, 1998.
- . *Gustav Mahler III: Die Symphonien*. Breitkopf & Härtel, 1985.
- . *Gustav Mahler: The Symphonies*. Translated by Vernon Wicker and Jutta Wicker, Portland, Amadeus Press, 1985.

- . *Gustav Mahler: Mahler und die Symphonik des 19. Jahrhunderts in neuer Deutung*. Breitkopf & Härtel, 1977.
- Fludernik, Monika. *Towards a Natural Narratology*. Routledge, 2002.
- Franklin, Peter. *The Life of Mahler*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Genette, Gérard. *Discours du Récit: Essai de Méthode*. Seuil, 1972.
- . *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin, Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Gülke Peter. "Review of Ludwig van Beethoven *Kesslersches Skizzenbuch*." *Die Musikforschung*, vol. 2, no. 36, 1983, pp. 101–102.
- Harrison, Thomas. *L'arte dell'incompiuto*. Castelveccchi, 2017.
- Hefling, Stephen E. "Mahler's 'Todtenfeier' and the Problem of Program Music." *19th-Century Music*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1988, pp. 27–53.
- . "Variations in Nuce: A Study of Mahler Sketches, and a Comment on Sketch Studies." *Gustav Mahler Kolloquium 1979*, edited by Rudolf Klein, Barenreiter, 1981, pp. 102–126.
- Hepokoski, James. "Approaching the First Movement of Beethoven's Tempest Sonata through Sonata Theory." *Beethoven's Tempest Sonata: Perspective of Analysis and Performance*, edited by Pieter Bergé, Peeters, 2009, pp. 71–89.
- Johnson, Julian. *Mahler's Voices: Expression and Irony in the Songs and Symphonies*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- . "Rehearing Lost Time: Proust and Mahler." *Romance Studies*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2014, pp. 88–98.
- Jongbloed, Jan. "Mahler's Tenth: Order of Composition of Its Movements." *Fragment or Completion? Mahler X Symposium, Selected Papers*, edited by Op de Coul, Nijgh & Van Ditmar Universitair, 1991, pp. 143–153.

- Kaplan, Richard. "The Interaction of Diatonic Collections in the Adagio of Mahler's Tenth Symphony." *In Theory Only*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1981, pp. 29–39.
- . "Interpreting Surface Harmonic Connections in the Adagio of Mahler's Tenth Symphony." *In Theory Only*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1978, pp. 32–44.
- Kinderman, William. "'Ich Bin Der Welt Abhanden Gekommen': Mahler's Rückert Setting and the Aesthetics of Integration in the Fifth Symphony." *The Musical Quarterly*, vol. 88, no. 2, 2006, pp. 232–73.
- Kinderman, William, and Joseph E. Jones, editors. *Genetic Criticism and the Creative Process: Essays from Music, Literature, and Theater*. University of Rochester Press, 2009.
- Kramer, Lawrence. *Classical Music and Postmodern Knowledge*. University of California Press, 1995.
- . "Musical Narratology: A Theoretical Outline." *Indiana Theory Review*, vol. 12, 1991, pp. 141–62.
- Kramer, Richard. *Unfinished Music*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Lambert, Philip. "Ives's Universe." *Ives Studies*, edited by Philip Lambert, Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 233–59.
- Liszka, James Jakob. *Semiotic of Myth: A Critical Study of the Symbol*. Indiana University Press, 1989.
- McCallum, Peter. "The Process in the Product: Exploratory Transitional Passages in Beethoven's Late Quartet Sketches." *Genetic Criticism and the Creative Process: Essays from Music, Literature, and Theater*, edited by William Kinderman and Joseph E. Jones, University of Rochester Press, 2009.
- Matthews, Colin. *Mahler at Work: Aspects of the Creative Process*. 1977. University of Sussex, PhD dissertation.

- . "Tempo Relationships in the Adagio of Mahler's Tenth Symphony, and Two Wrong Notes." *The Musical Times*, vol. 151, no. 1910, 2010, pp. 3–8.
- . "The Tenth Symphony." *The Mahler Companion*, edited by Donald Mitchell and Andrew Nicholson, Oxford University Press, 2002, pp. 491–507.
- Matthews, David. "Wagner, Lipiner, and the 'Purgatorio.'" *The Mahler Companion*, edited by Donald Mitchell and Andrew Nicholson, Oxford University Press, 2002, pp. 508–16.
- Maus, Fred Everett. "Music as Narrative." *Indiana Theory Review*, 12, Spring and Fall 1991, pp. 1–34.
- Meyer, Leonard B. *Style and Music: Theory, History, and Ideology*. University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Micznik, Vera. "Music and Narrative Revisited: Degrees of Narrativity in Beethoven and Mahler." *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, vol. 126, no. 2, 2001, pp. 193–249.
- . "'Ways of Telling' in Mahler's Music: The Third Symphony as Narrative Text." *Perspectives on Gustav Mahler*, edited by Jeremy Barham, Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005, pp. 295–323.
- Mitchell, Donald. *Gustav Mahler: Songs and Symphonies of Life and Death*. Faber & Faber, 1985.
- Mitchell, Donald, and Andrew Nicholson, editors. *The Mahler Companion*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Monahan, Seth. *Mahler's Sonata Narratives*. 2008. University of Yale, PhD dissertation. *UMI Dissertation Services*.
- . *Mahler's Symphonic Sonatas*. Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Nattiez, Jean-Jacques. "Can One Speak of Narrativity in Music?" *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, vol. 115, no. 2, 1990, pp. 240–57.
- . "Racconto Letterario e 'Racconto' Musicale. A Proposito di un'illusione Omologica."

- La Narratologia Musicale. Applicazioni e Prospettive*, edited by Angela Carone, Trauben, 2006, pp. 227–274.
- Newcomb, Anthony. “Action and Agency in Mahler's Ninth Symphony, Second Movement.” *Music and Meaning*, edited by Jennifer Robinson, Cornell University Press, 1997, pp. 131–153.
- . “Narrative Archetypes and Mahler's Ninth Symphony.” *Music and Text: Critical Inquiries*, edited by Paul Scher, Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp. 118–36.
- Nikkels, Eveline, “Ist Mahlers Zehnte Symphonie ein Lied vom Tode?” *Fragment or Completion? Mahler X Symposium: Selected Papers*, edited by Paul Op de Coul, Nijgh & Van Ditmar Universitair, 1991, pp. 165–172.
- Op de Coul, Paul, editor. *Fragment or Completion? Mahler X Symposium: Selected Papers*. Nijgh & Van Ditmar Universitair, 1991.
- Painter, Karen, editor. *Mahler and His World*. Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Pauset, Eve-Norah. *Marcel Proust et Gustav Mahler: Créateurs Parallèles: L'expression Du Moi Et Du Temps Dans La Littérature Et La Musique Au Début Du XX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*. Editions L'Harmattan, 2007.
- Peattie, Thomas. “In Search of Lost Time: Memory and Mahler's Broken Pastoral.” *Mahler and His World*, edited by Karen Painter, Princeton University Press, 2002, pp. 185–198.
- Pinto, Angelo. “Mahler's Search for Lost Time: A ‘Genetic’ Perspective on Musical Narrativity.” *Gli Spazi della Musica*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2017, pp. 1–37.
- . “On this Side of the Composing Hut. Narrativity and Compositional Process in the Fifth movement of Mahler's Tenth Symphony,” *De Musica*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2019, pp. 52–125.
- Prince, Gerald. “Narrative Analysis and Narratology.” *New Literary History*, vol. 13, no. 2, 1982, pp. 179–88.
- Principe, Quirino. *Mahler: La Musica tra Eros e Thanatos*. Bompiani, 2003.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and narrative*. Vol. 3. Translated by K Blamey and D Pelleaur.

University of Chicago Press, 1990.

---. *Tempo e Racconto, Vol. I*. Translated by Giuseppe Gampa. Jaca Book, 1986.

Ratz, Erwin. "Zum Formproblem bei Gustav Mahler: Eine Analyse des ersten Satzes der IX Symphonie." *Die Musikforschung*, vol. 8H, no. 2/3, 1955, pp. 169–177.

Rothkamm, Jörg. "Who Composed Songs Published Under Alma Mahler's Name? Previously Unknown Letters of the Composer and How They Pertain to the Revision of Her Works in 1910." *Die Musikforschung*, vol. 53, no. 4, 2000, pp. 432–45.

---. *Gustav Mahlers Zehnte Symphonie: Entstehung, Analyse, Rezeption*. P. Lang, 2003.

Sallis, Friedemann. "Coming to terms with the composer's working manuscripts." *A Handbook to Twentieth-Century Musical Sketches*, edited by Patricia and Friedemann Sallis. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Sallis, Friedemann. *Music Sketches*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Samuels, Robert. *Mahler's Sixth Symphony: A Study in Musical Semiotics*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.

---. "Mahler Within Mahler: Allusion as Quotation, Self-Reference, and Metareference." *Self-Reference in Literature and Other Media*, edited by Bernhart and Werner Wolf, Rodopi, 2010, pp. 33–50.

---. "Narrative Form and Mahler's Musical Thinking." *Nineteenth-Century Music Review*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2011, pp. 237–54.

Scheffel, Michael. "Narrative Constitution." *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, edited by Peter Hühn, et al. [www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/narrative-constitution](http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/narrative-constitution).

Searle, John R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Smith Herrnstein, Barbara. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. University of



Chicago Press, 1968.

Specht, Richard. *Gustav Mahler, Nachgelassene Zehnte Symphonie: Einführende Bemerkungen*. Zsolnay, 1924.

Stoll-Knecht, Anna. *The Genesis of Mahler's Seventh Symphony*. 2014. New York University, PhD dissertation. *UMI Dissertation Services*.

Subotnik, Rose Rosengard. "Romantic Music as Post-Kantian Critique: Classicism, Romanticism, and the Concept of the Semiotic Universe." *On Criticizing Music: Five Philosophical Perspectives*, edited by Kingsley Price, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981, pp. 87–95.

Tarasti, Eero. *A Theory of Musical Semiotics*. Indiana University Press, 1994.

---. *Myth and Music: A Semiotic Approach to the Aesthetics of Myth in Music Especially That of Wagner, Sibelius and Stravinsky*. Mouton, 1979.

Taruskin, Richard. *The Danger of Music and Other Anti-Utopian Essays*. University of California Press, 2008.

White, Hayden. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1980, pp. 5–27.

---. "The Narrativization of Real Events." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1981, pp. 793–798.

Wolf, Werner, et al., editors. *Metareference Across Media: Theory and Case Studies: Dedicated to Walter Bernhart on the Occasion of His Retirement*. Rodopi, 2009.

Zychowicz, James L. *Sketches and Drafts of Gustav Mahler, 1892–1901: The Sources of the Fourth Symphony. (Volumes I and II)*. 1988. University of Cincinnati, PhD dissertation.

---. "Re-Evaluating the Sources of Mahler's Music." *Perspectives on Gustav Mahler*, edited by Jeremy Barham, Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005, pp. 457–547.

---. "'They Only Give Rise to Misunderstandings': Mahler's Sketches in Context." *Genetic Criticism and the Creative Process: Essays from Music, Literature, and Theater*, edited

by William Kinderman, and Joseph E. Jones, University of Rochester Press, 2009, p. 151  
–169.